THE LIFE OF SIR ROBERT MORAY

THE LIFE OF SIR ROBERT MORAY

SOLDIER, STATESMAN AND MAN OF SCIENCE

(1608–1673)

BY

ALEXANDER ROBERTSON,

M.A. (Edin.) B.LITT. (Oxon.)

LATE LECTURER IN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C. 4

NEW YORK, TORONTO

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS

1922

B
M966r
186544

Made in Great Britain

3 1223 02029 7074

PREFACE

ALEXANDER ROBERTSON

ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, one of the band of young scholars who fell in the Great War, was born on the 12th of January, 1882. His father, the late Robert Robertson, a distinguished student of the University of Edinburgh, was for many years headmaster of the Edinburgh Ladies' College, one of the largest secondary schools for girls in the kingdom. Alexander, who was the elder son, was educated at George Watson's College, Edinburgh, where he gained, among other prizes, the silver medal for English. Having matriculated at the University of Edinburgh in 1901, he won distinction in the various classes he attended, and graduated M.A. in 1904. Two years later he concluded his university course by taking First Class Honours in History. After a term as *assistant anglais* at the Lycée at Caen, he returned to his old school as History Master. In the four years that followed, all his spare time was given to strenuous study, while holidays in France and Germany afforded him an opportunity of perfecting his knowledge of foreign languages. The work of a schoolmaster, however, proved irksome to one whose interests were primarily those of a scholar; and although he was gradually coming to his own as a teacher, and attracting the respect and even devotion which boys of a certain type render to a master whom they admire, he was glad when the award of a Carnegie Scholarship enabled him to proceed to the University of Oxford. This *Life of Sir Robert Moray*, for which he received the degree of B.Litt. in 1913, was the result of two years' study as a research student of New College. A third year, during which he held a Carnegie Fellowship, was devoted to a "Life of Sir William Lockhart of Lee"—another distinguished soldier and diplomatist of the seventeenth century—which has not yet been published.

His appointment as Lecturer in History in the University of Sheffield in January, 1914, realised his long cherished ambition to secure an academic post ; but when, eight months later, the war broke out, the path of honour and duty was clear to him. With his usual conscientiousness, he refused a commission on the ground that he did not know " one end of a rifle from the other," and enlisted, in September, 1914, as a private soldier in " A " (University) Company of the Sheffield University and City Battalion, afterwards the 12th (Service) Battalion of the York and Lancaster Regiment. He was no athlete, and to a man of his nervous and sensitive temperament, military duties were totally uncongenial. But his indomitable will power enabled him to overcome his aversion, and he found compensation in the friendships he formed among his comrades of " A " company. In December, 1915, he was ordered to Egypt, where, as the historian of the battalion notes, many of the members of " A " company spent their scanty hours of leisure in learning Italian and reading Dante. When the battalion proceeded to France in the following March, Robertson was detained for five weeks in hospital at Marseilles. He rejoined his unit on the eve of the Battle of the Somme, and fell with many of his comrades in the attack on Serre on the 1st of July, 1916.

Like not a few of his gifted contemporaries in the trenches, Robertson was led to give poetic expression to his thoughts and experiences. *Comrades*, dated " Somewhere in France, May 28, 1916," ran into three editions ; and in 1918 another booklet was published under the title of *The Last Poems of Alexander Robertson*, with an introduction by the late Professor Hume Brown, Historiographer-Royal for Scotland.[1]

These poems reflect the thoughts of the author during his

[1] Nos. 36 and 45 respectively of the " Second Century " of the Vigo Cabinet Series published by Elkin Mathews, London. The second edition of *Comrades* contained a portrait of the author. Three of the poems appeared in *Soldier Poets* (Erskine Macdonald, 1916), and two in *The Muse in Arms*, edited by E. B. Osborn (Murray, 1917). See also *For Remembrance : Soldier Poets who have Fallen in the War*, by A. St. John Adcock (Hodder and Stoughton, second edition, 1920), pp. 214–8 ; and R. A. Sparling's *History of the 12th Service Battalion York and Lancaster Regiment* (Sheffield, 1920), pp. 58, 73 and appendix.

military life. In " Passing Oxford in a Troop-Train," for example, he meditates on the strange chance which has brought " The scholar's city into view," and

> " The Cumnor Hills with Arnold's tree
> And Iffley's ancient house of prayer
> And sunlit slopes of Shotover."

In " A Wish : New College Library," a copy of which now hangs on its walls, he would fain once more

> " Sit by the open window where the air
> Comes fragrant from the garden's blaze of flowers
> And unselfconscious pass the silent hours
> Of afternoon, or wander here and there
> Finding quaint wisdom in old volumes rare."

Among the many memories which crowd upon him during the voyage through the Mediterranean Sea, " The Pillars of Hercules " recall the fabled isles, where

> " . . . with wistful minds they set
> Beyond the guardian terror of these seas
> The beauty of the hid Hesperides."

But whether he dwells on love of Oxford days, the literary and historical associations of the scene, or home ties and affections, there runs through all the characteristic note of the stern self-discipline with which he braced himself for the ordeal of battle :—

> " . . . . . keen to maintain,
> Though not assurèd, hope in beneficent pain,
> Hope that the truth of the world is not what appears,
> Hope in the triumph of man for the price of his tears."

For those of us who knew him well, the poems are " the vivid presentment of the man." As Professor Hume Brown wrote : " They display all his intellectual eagerness, his consuming desire ' to know the best that has been thought and said in the world.' Everywhere the poems suggest a wide outlook on life and the world—the result of earnest reflection and of wide and various reading. They suggest, moreover, a mind

that had long grappled with life's problems and had arrived at conclusions which sufficed for the inspiration of his own . . . [They] are the testimony of one who spent his life in converse with the noblest ideals, and was prepared to make the greatest of sacrifices at the call of what he regarded as his duty." Robertson's main characteristics were, indeed, a certain high seriousness, an over-ruling sense of duty and of loyalty to truth as he saw it, and a fastidious conscientiousness. To the casual acquaintance he might seem reserved and even proud. But his intimate friends were aware that the reserve was the almost unconscious defence of one essentially shy and not infrequently diffident of his own powers. Nor were these qualities inconsistent with a happy wit and repartee—"Robertsonianisms," as his set at Oxford termed them—which made him the centre of any gathering of kindred spirits.

To one of Robertson's temperament and interests, the varied career and character of Sir Robert Moray made a strong appeal. He thoroughly enjoyed a study which involved researches in the libraries and archives of Oxford, London, and Edinburgh, Yester House in Berwickshire, and Maastricht in Holland, and which allowed him to sojourn once again in Paris. To France, like a true "Scot Abroad," he was devotedly attached; and his own brief military service in that country now adds a touch of pathos to his account of Sir Robert's career as a recruiting agent for France and as Colonel of the Scottish Guards—an aspect of Scottish history which the unpublished material in Paris enabled him to elucidate fully for the first time. The same thoroughness characterises those chapters which throw fresh light on the relations between Charles I. and the Scots, on certain problems of the Restoration, and on the administration of Scotland during the Lauderdale regime. That he saw his subject "steadily and saw it whole"—to adapt the words of his favourite poet—is proved by his excellent chapter on Sir Robert Moray and the Royal Society in which the development of science in this country is dealt with in the light of a general European movement. Nor can the discerning reader

fail to realise something of the biographer's own character from the sympathetic care and minuteness with which the moral and intellectual qualities of Sir Robert are set forth.

Only a few pages of the revision which Robertson had in hand have been traced, and the work is now published substantially as he left it. In some places the narrative has been condensed by the present writer, mainly for reasons of space, but in the abbreviated version the language of the original has been preserved. Another of his friends, Mr. F. P. Wilson, Lincoln College, Oxford, has kindly read the proofs.

In the circumstances it is now impossible to record the names of all to whom the author was indebted in the course of his researches. Mention may be made of the late Marquess of Tweeddale, who readily granted access to the Lauderdale Letters preserved at Yester House; of the late Mr. David Douglas, Edinburgh, for kind permission to utilise the transcripts of the Kincardine Papers in his possession; and of the officials of the Royal Society for similar facilities. During the progress of the work Sir Charles Firth was a continual source of help and encouragement.

Finally, a grant from the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland, which has facilitated the publication of the work in its present form, is gratefully acknowledged.

HENRY W. MEIKLE.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	1608–1641	1
	EARLY YEARS—RELATIONS WITH RICHELIEU AND THE SCOTTISH COVENANTERS.	
II.	1641–1645	11
	FORMATION OF THE NEW REGIMENT OF THE SCOTTISH GUARDS—MORAY APPOINTED LIEUTENANT-COLONEL—CAMPAIGN UNDER D'ENGHIEN AND GUÉBRIANT—IMPRISONMENT IN BAVARIA.	
III.	1645–1651	31
	DIPLOMACY AND POLITICS.	
IV.	1645–1650	62
	COLONEL OF THE SCOTTISH GUARDS—THE RECRUITING OF SOLDIERS FOR FRANCE.	
V.	1652–1655	77
	THE GLENCAIRN RISING.	
VI.	1655–1663	98
	EXILE—THE RESTORATION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND	
VII.	1663–1673	123
	SCOTTISH POLITICS.	
VIII.	THE ROYAL SOCIETY	148
IX.	CHARACTERISTICS, MORAL AND MENTAL ..	170
X.	CONCLUSION	192

APPENDICES

A.	MS. SOURCES	201
B.	CAPITULATION BETWEEN LA FERTÉ-IMBAULT AND KINTYRE..	206
C.	CHARLES I. AND THE SCOTS, APRIL, 1646	212
D.	MORAY'S LETTER TO CHARLES II.	215

ABBREVIATIONS

A.P.S.	*Acts of the Parliament of Scotland.* Record Series.
Airy, *L.P.*	*The Lauderdale Papers*, ed. O. Airy. 3 vols. Camden Society, 1884–5.
Arch. des Aff. Ét	*Archives des Affaires Étrangères* (Angleterre MSS.), Paris.
Burnet, *O.T.*	G. Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, ed. O. Airy. 2 vols. Oxford, 1897; *Supplement*, ed. H. C. Foxcroft. Oxford, 1902.
D.N.B.	*Dictionary of National Biography.*
Firth, *S. and C.*	*Scotland and the Commonwealth*, ed. C. H. Firth. Scottish History Society, 1895.
Firth, *S. and P.*	*Scotland and the Protectorate*, ed. C. H. Firth. Scottish History Society, 1898.
Gardiner, *G.C.W.* ..	S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Great Civil War.* 4 vols. London, 1898.
Gardiner, *C. and P.* ..	S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate.* 4 vols. London, 1903.
H.M.C. Reports ..	*Historical MSS. Commission Reports.*
Huygens, *Corr.*	*Oeuvres Completes de Christiaan Huygens. Correspondance.* 10 vols. Société Hollandaise des Sciences, La Haye, 1888–1905.

K P.	*Kincardine Papers* (Transcripts).
L.P.	*Lauderdale Papers.* British Museum Add. MSS.
M.C.	*The Diplomatic Correspondence of Jean de Montereul and the brothers De Belliévre* . . . ed. J. G. Fotheringham. 2 vols. Scottish History Society, 1898–9.
P.R.O.	Public Record Office.
R.P.C. of Scot.	*Register of the Privy Council of Scotland.* Record Series.
Sprat	T. Sprat, *History of the Royal Society.* 2nd edn., London, 1702.
Tw. MSS.	*Tweeddale MSS.* (Lauderdale Letters). Yester House, Berwickshire, the property of the Marquess of Tweeddale.
Wodrow	J. Wodrow, *The History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the Restoration to the Revolution.* 2 vols. fol. Edin. 1721.

CHAPTER I

1608–1641

EARLY YEARS—RELATIONS WITH RICHELIEU AND THE SCOTTISH COVENANTERS

In the reign of David the First a Fleming called Freskin obtained large estates in Moray and in the south of Scotland. A descendant of his second grandson, named Walter de Moravia, held extensive lands in Moray, and acquired, probably by marriage, the lordship of Bothwell in Lanarkshire. From him were descended the Morays of Bothwell. During the War of Independence Sir Andrew Moray of Bothwell helped to defend the national cause. His grandson, Sir John, married (1299) Mary, only daughter of Malise, sixth Earl of Strathearn, and thus acquired, with other lands, those of Abercairney in that Earldom.[1] The fortunes of the Morays of Abercairney from 1299 to 1574 need not be traced. In the latter year a certain Robert Moray became the head of the family. His third son, Sir Mungo Moray of Craigie, in Perthshire, married a daughter of George Halkett of Pitfirran. Their family consisted of two sons, Robert and William, of whom the latter, as Sir William Moray, became Master of the Works to Charles II., and the former, the future Sir Robert Moray, was destined to a distinguished career.[2]

Robert, the elder of the two brothers, was born between the 10th of March, 1608, and the 10th of March, 1609.[3] His

[1] *H.M.C. Reports*, III. *MSS. of the Morays of Abercairney*, 416.

[2] Burke, *Landed Gentry of Great Britain*, 11th edition, 1906, 1186–87. Burke is an unsatisfactory authority, but he is the only one with regard to the question of Moray's parentage.

[3] *Rijks Archieven in Limburg*, Maastricht. Moray resided in Maastricht (1657–1659) and in the archives of that town there is one document relating to an event which happened during his stay. He appeared before the authorities on March 10th, 1659. "On the 10th of March, 1659, appeared Sir Robert Moray, Knight, born in Scotland, Privy Councillor of the King of Great Britain in Scotland, and Colonel of the Scottish Guards in the service of His Majesty, the King of France, aged fifty years, presented by Everard, master of the Craft of masons. He took under this craft the necessary oath, and the right of citizenship was granted him, according to custom."

father, Sir Mungo Moray, died at some date between 1617 and 1629.[1] Of his education practically nothing is known. According to Anthony Wood, "his youth was spent in good letters, partly in the University of St. Andrews, and partly in France"[2]; while according to John Aubrey, "his juvenile education was at school and the University."[3] He was certainly not a student at the University of St. Andrews[4]; and it is impossible to say at which, if any, of the French Universities or Colleges his time was spent.

With regard to the next stage of his career Aubrey states that "he betook himself to military employment in the service of Louis XIII. He was at last Lieutenant-Colonel to ——. They say he was an excellent soldier."[5] Wood repeats these statements,[6] and Burnet also mentions that "he served in France."[7] He may have been in a French regiment, but it is much more probable that he was in a Scottish regiment or company. Before 1639 there was only one such regiment,[8] and one such company in the French army. The latter was the famous Compagnie de Gens d'Armes Écossais, re-established in 1624, and nominally composed of 100 men. An incomplete list of their names has been preserved, and that of Moray does not figure in it.[9] On the whole, it is more likely

[1] *Registrum Magni Sigilli Regum Scotorum*, Record Series, 1617, p. 568, no. 1575. Apud Edinburgh, 23 January . . . Test. M. Wil. Buchannane, preposito de Methven, *Quintigerno* et Jacobo Murrayis fratribus germanis dicti D. Wil. (Murray de Abercairney, militis). *Reg. Mag. Sig.*, 1629, p. 470, no. 1388. Apud Holyrood, 1 April. . . . Tenend. dicto Wil. juniori et heredibus masc. ejus de corpore legitime procreandis, quibus deficientibus, Davidi M., ejus fratri et heredibus (etc.), quibus def., *Roberto M. filio seniori legit. quond. Quintigerni M.*, fratris dicti D. Wil., et heredibus, etc.

[2] A. Wood, *Athenae Oxon.*, 3rd edition, London, 1813–1820, III. 725–26.

[3] John Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, ed. A Clark, Oxford, 1898, II. 81.

[4] The Matriculation Roll of St. Andrews University contains the signatures of all the students. Between 1612–1629 there is only one Robert Murray
1612: Entered at St. Leonard's College, St. Andrews, Robertus Murray.
1615: Graduated M.A., Robertus Moray.
Scottish University students of former times were very youthful, but to graduate at the age of seven must have been beyond even their competence!

[5] John Aubrey, *op. cit.*, II. 81.

[6] A. Wood, *op. cit.*, III. 725–26.

[7] G. Burnet, *Hist. of My Own Time*, ed. O. Airy, Oxford, 1897, I. 104.

[8] *Lettres, Instructions Diplomatiques et Papiers d'État du Cardinal de Richelieu*, ed. Denis Avenel (Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France), Paris, 1853–1877, VI. 88–89.

[9] F. Michel, *Les Écossais en France*, Londr. et Bordeaux, 1862, II. 280–85.

that he belonged to the Scottish regiment which joined the French army under Colonel Sir John Hepburn in 1633.[1]

In whatever regiment he served, there seems to be little doubt that Moray must have gained a considerable reputation. Burnet's statement that " he got into such a degree of favour with Cardinal Richelieu that few strangers were ever so much considered by him as he was " [2] is confirmed, to some extent, by the independent testimony of Patrick Gordon in his *Short Abridgement of Britane's Distemper*, written probably between 1647 and 1650, but not published till 1844.[3] Gordon's assertions as to Moray's relations with Richelieu are, however, much more precise than those of Burnet ; indeed, he is the only authority who gives a detailed account of any of Moray's actions before 1642. What he says is so interesting and important that it deserves to be quoted in full :—

" For how soon the Puritans began to vent their malcontents against King Charles, for seeking to establish the English form of worship in Scotland by the Service-Book, when the French King's darling, his minion, by whose advice all was done, and without whom nothing could be intended or concluded—that rich store-house of state policy—Cardinal de Richelieu, his far-reaching projects took hold of this fit occasion that Britain might also be a sufferer and no longer a beholder " [*i.e.*, of the Thirty Years' War]. " To this end there is an ambassador for England to capitulate with King Charles for establishment of a new league, offensive and defensive, with France ; which the King was too wise to yield unto, having received no injury from his neighbour Princes, nor had Spain nor the Austrian family given him any just occasion to break the peace already concluded with them. Nevertheless, he promised to prove a kind and loving friend to his brother of France, if any Prince of Christendom encroached upon him or sought his prejudice. Although this was all that could be looked for from so judicious a Prince, yet could it not be satisfaction to the

[1] *D.N.B.*, IX. 609, *s.v.* Sir John Hepburn.
[2] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 104.
[3] P. Gordon, *Short Abridgement of Britane's Distemper*, Spalding Club, 1844, 5–6 ; *D.N.B.*, VIII. 222, *s.v.* Patrick Gordon.

Cardinal, who sought but an occasion to put fuel to that fire which was but newly begun to burn in Britain by the headstrong and never-pleased Puritan faction.

"Wherefore, choosing forth a man fit for his purpose amongst a great many of the Scots gentry that haunted the French court (for by reason of the ancient league betwixt the French and them, they love always to breed themselves in France) he chooses forth one, Sir Robert Moray, a man endowed with sundry rare qualities, and a very able man for the Cardinal's project. After he had sounded the depth of this man's mind, and finding he was indifferent so as he could make a fortune, whether it were with the King or with the malcontented Puritans, he finds no difficulty to persuade him that his love to the Scots, by virtue of the ancient league, made him extremely to lament their case; for that (their King was now in hand with) was not, as it was pretended, merely for religion, but the chief end both of the King and his cabinet council was to reduce Scotland to a province, without which he was strongly persuaded that he could never bring the whole island to one entire monarchy; but if the Scots, said they, will stand to their ancient freedom, France shall not be wanting in so just a cause. In end, this gentleman was so taken with divers favours and courtesies which the Cardinal thrust upon him, as he takes in hand to return home and work upon this subject. Wherein he advanced so far, as the next year after he went back to give an account of his endeavours, and having (as it was found by event) bound up a secret league between the Cardinal and Argyle, who was then the head of the Covenant, to show how well the Cardinal was pleased, the Earl of Irvine, Argyle's brother, is chosen to have the leading of 2,000 men, to be levied in Scotland, and sent over to France, with many new privileges, as that they should be one of the first regiments of the Guard, and that they should have their preachers with them and free use of their religion, with sundry other favours: the money is sent, the regiment levied, and Sir Robert Moray made Lieutenant-Colonel."

It is not easy to determine how much truth there is in this narrative. The question involves a brief consideration of Richelieu's attitude to the Scottish rebellions of 1639 and 1640, so far as that is known from sources other than

Gordon's book. If Richelieu had any relations with the Scottish Covenanters, they must have been formed between August, 1637, when the riot occurred in the Church of St. Giles, and August, 1640, when the Second Bishops' War terminated. During most of the period, Pomponne de Bellièvre was French Ambassador in England.[1]

From July, 1637, until the summer of 1638, negotiations were being carried on between France and England, and it was hoped that the articles of an alliance for mutual assistance might be agreed on. This fact, and many others, make it impossible to believe in the authenticity of the correspondence between Richelieu and d'Estrades (Nov., Dec., 1637), according to which d'Estrades was sent to ask for the neutrality of England should France and Holland attack the Spanish Netherlands. Charles, in fact, told Bellièvre that he would help the allies, and yet in d'Estrades' letter it is said that he refused even to remain neutral, and that, in consequence, Richelieu resolved to send his almoner, the Abbé Chambres, to Scotland. There, along with a Lord Gordon and a clergyman, Mobil, he was to incite the Scots to active hostility against their King.[2]

Just as the Cardinal made no attempt to inflame the Scots before the summer of 1638, so, after March, 1639, he made no definite promises to them. With regard to the intervening period, the matter is not so certain. By the summer of 1638 the English Government had shown that the proposed treaty with France would not be concluded. Early in March, 1639, Bellièvre was convinced that Henrietta Maria was at the head of a strong Spanish party in the English court. All this must have been annoying for Richelieu, and therefore it is rather significant that, by the 24th of March, Chambres had arrived in England.[3] According to Salomon,[4] he either

[1] C. H. Firth, *Notes on the Diplomatic Relations of England and France, 1603–88*, Oxford, 1906, 35–36. Bellièvre was recalled in Feb. 1640.

[2] Ranke, *History of England*, Oxford, 1875, V. App., 457–63.

[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 47, f. 416.

[4] F. Salomon, *Frankreichs Beziehungen zu dem Schottischen Aufstand*, Berlin, 1890, 16.

went, or was intended to go, as far as Scotland, and the unknown writer of a letter of April, 1640, declares that he saw a letter from Chambres' brother to the almoner, in which there was the following clause :—

" That he rejoiced much at the favour his brother, the almoner, had with his master, and that thereby he had so obliged the nobility of Scotland, which was a great contentment and expectation too for them all."[1]

These words are suspicious, and Ranke, who discredited the d'Estrades correspondence, says of Chambres : " Alliances between the Scots and Cardinal Richelieu had already been formed ; they were carried on through his almoner." [2]

However this may be, Bellièvre did enter into relations with the Scots. In March he had proposed that this should be done, and on the 7th of July he reported that he had spoken to some Scots of the Covenanting party. They had already left for Edinburgh in order to further his designs there.

" Mais cela ne suffit pas," he continued. " Il est nécessaire de donner cette affaire à déduire à une ou deux personnes d'esprit, auxquels on se puisse fier, tels que sont deux Écossais qui sont en cette ville, lesquels n'ont pas assez de bien pour faire le voyage à leurs dépenses."[3]

On the 8th of August Chavigny, one of the ministers employed under Richelieu, replied that Louis XIII. had never intended to entangle himself in the affairs of Scotland. In any case, the present moment was not favourable, and, moreover, Bellièvre must indicate who were the two persons of whom he had spoken. On the 2nd of October Chavigny wrote again in a negative strain.[4] Nevertheless, Loudoun and the Scots still maintained relations through Dishington with the French Ambassador. They announced their intention of requesting Louis XIII. to mediate between them and Charles if their dispute with him was not shortly settled. If mediation should prove impossible, they would ask the French King for protection.

[1] *Cal. Dom. S.P.* (1640), 100–01.
[2] Ranke, *op. cit.*, II. 156.
[3] Ranke, *ibid.*, V. App., 457–63.
[4] F. Salomon, *op. cit.*, 24–27, 51–53

After Bellièvre's recall in February, 1640, William Colvil arrived in Paris about the 10th of March with a letter from the Covenanting leaders to Louis XIII.[1] Richelieu refused to make any dangerous promises. Still he was anxious not to offend the Scots, and he suggested that, if England concluded an alliance with Spain, France would conclude one with Scotland.[2]

Thus it appears that, although there is no definite proof that Richelieu had made actual arrangements with the Scottish rebels, yet he did not refuse to encourage them with vague hopes. In other words, he favoured a policy which would not compromise the French Government, but which would greatly influence the decisions of the Scottish leaders.

In the light of the facts which have been mentioned, how far does Gordon's story seem probable? He states that Moray was sent to Scotland in 1639; and it is in the early part of that year, as we have seen, that Richelieu's actions are open to suspicion. Moray probably was in Scotland in 1639, for, according to Anthony Wood, "he was General of the Ordnance in Scotland when the Presbyterians there first set up and maintained their Covenant."[3] Richelieu may have sent Moray to Scotland to levy troops for the French service. Other Scots, such as Alexander Erskine, half-brother of the Earl of Mar, were sent north in 1638 for this purpose.[4] Or again, like many other Scottish soldiers of fortune, he may have returned to his native country at the beginning of the troubles. In either case Richelieu may have requested Moray, of whom he had a high opinion, to urge on revolt, and he may have held out indefinite hopes of French support in certain eventualities. On the other hand, if Moray was in Scotland as a recruiting officer at that time, Gordon may have drawn unwarranted inferences from his activity in that capacity. If Richelieu did send him to Scotland to foment rebellion, it is strange that Bellièvre

[1] *Cal. Dom. S.P.* (1640), 103–104.
[2] Denis Avenel, *op. cit.*, VI. 676–78.
[3] A. Wood, *op. cit.*, III. 725–6.
[4] D. Avenel, *op. cit.*, V. 847; *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 47, f. 238.

should have remained in ignorance. This appears to have been the case: for in March, 1639, Bellièvre proposed French interference in Scottish affairs as something new. Nor is it likely that Moray was one of the two "*personnes d'esprit*" of whom Bellièvre wrote in July, 1639. Richelieu does not seem to have approved of them. Chavigny's letter of October, objecting to the proposal, was even more emphatic than that of August. Yet by October he would know the names of the persons whom the ambassador suggested for employment. This does not accord with Burnet's account of the Cardinal's opinion of Moray's abilities. Finally, it may be noted that Gordon's statements are too often made without adequate substantiation. No proof exists of "a secret league between the Cardinal and Argyle," and one would like to know what were "the divers favours and courtesies thrust" upon Moray.

Yet in spite of the many arguments that may be brought forward against the assertion that Moray was Richelieu's political agent, it is difficult simply to ignore the statements in the *Short Abridgement*. It is true that no other contemporary royalist historian—neither Wishart the biographer of Montrose, nor James Gordon—makes any mention of such a relationship. But Patrick Gordon has signal merits as an historical writer. He is not impartial, but he generally speaks of persons with sobriety and moderation. He wrote shortly after the events in question, and he displays considerable knowledge of Scottish affairs.

If his narrative is untrue, it is not likely to be deliberately false. It is possible that Gordon had information from a source not open to others, and that he was prevented from substantiating his charges by the fact that their object was alive and in Scotland when he was writing. His informant, therefore, might not wish to be known. If this theory is correct, Gordon's inaccuracy may have been unintentional. Moreover, the object which Gordon had in view in his *Short Abridgement* must be kept in mind. In 1647, Wishart had issued his work on Montrose, and Gordon considered that the actions of the royalist, Huntly, had been placed in an un-

favourable light.[1] He intended to rectify the error and, but for his death in 1650, his *Short Abridgement* would have been published at an early date.[2] Huntly, who was captain of the Compagnie de Gens d'Armes Écossais, had not served in France since 1636[3]; and by 1639 he was bitterly opposed to that country, as he considered that he had been badly treated by the French Government.[4] In 1642 Lothian tried to make an arrangement with him as to the future command of the Company, but Huntly proved a very difficult person to deal with.[5] He was no doubt greatly annoyed at the much more generous treatment which, he assumed, Irvine and Moray had received (1642),[6] and he would be inclined to attribute it to Argyle's political position as a Covenanter. Gordon evidently shared this view; and it is permissible, therefore, to suppose that, owing to the hostility between the families of Huntly and Argyle, Gordon drew unwarranted inferences regarding the conduct of Argyle and Moray from circumstances which were merely suspicious.

Obviously it is impossible to pronounce for certain what relations, if any, there were between Moray and Richelieu in regard to the Scottish rebellions. But the remarks in the *Short Abridgement* at least imply that Moray was in Scotland in 1639, and it has been seen that Anthony Wood makes a more definite statement to that effect. According to Gordon, he returned to France in 1640. This may be true, but it is unlikely that he remained there for any length of time. The Covenanting leaders kept as many military men in Scotland as possible. Erskine, for example, who had come from France in 1638 in order to raise a regiment, was still in the north in August, 1640. In that month, as well as in the corresponding month of 1639, the leading Covenanters wrote

[1] J. Dunn in the Preface to the *Short Abridgement.*

[2] According to Dunn he probably died before 1660. In the *D.N.B.*, VIII. 222, the date 1650 is given.

[3] W. Gordon, *Hist. of the House of Gordon*, Edin. 1726, II. 171.

[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 47, f. 545.

[5] *Corr. of the Earls of Ancrum and Lothian*, ed. D. Lans, Edin. 1875, I. 140.

[6] As a matter of fact the French Government was not at all forward in bestowing favours upon Irvine and Moray. See *post*, Chap. II.

to the Cardinal, asking him to excuse Erskine's delay, and giving the reasons for it.[1] Moreover, during 1642, Moray would be in Scotland helping to raise men for the regiment of Guards. On the 5th of November, 1641, indeed, there is mention in the Acts of Parliament of Scotland of a Robert Murray who was General Quartermaster, and this may have been the Moray with whom we are concerned.[2]

Thus far, however, there is little that can be certainly known about him. Henceforth, it will be possible to narrate with much greater assurance the events of his career.

[1] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 47, f. 544, for 1639 letter; *H.M.C. Reports*, IV. *Erskine-Murray MSS.*, 523–24, for 1640 letter.
[2] *A.P.S.*, V. 381, 693.

CHAPTER II

1641–1645

FORMATION OF THE NEW REGIMENT OF THE SCOTTISH GUARDS —MORAY APPOINTED LIEUTENANT-COLONEL—CAMPAIGN UNDER D'ENGHIEN AND GUÉBRIANT—IMPRISONMENT IN BAVARIA.

Society and institutions in France underwent important changes in the course of the seventeenth century, but no transformation was more marked than that of the army. In times of peace the predecessors of Louis XIII. maintained only a few regiments of infantry and some companies of cavalry. Even if they had the wish to maintain a large army, they were not in the position to do so. Henry IV. was content with a peace establishment of 10,000 men. This number increased during the minority of his successor, but the augmentation was not very great until the fourth decade of the century when France engaged in war against the House of Hapsburg. By 1639 the foot-soldiers numbered 125,800 and the cavalry 22,380.[1]

It had been no easy matter to achieve this result, and the task had been rendered more difficult by the conditions under which it had to be performed. Had it been possible to institute obligatory military service, the matter would have been comparatively simple ; but, in the seventeenth century, when the system of privilege was dominant, no such idea could be entertained.[2] Voluntary enlistment was the only alternative. In these circumstances Richelieu was forced to look for soldiers outside as well as within the realm. Not only was the supply of French volunteers inadequate ; they were lacking in other respects.

[1] Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, VI. (ii), 317–318 ; Georges d'Avenel, *Richelieu et la Monarchie Absolue*, III. 42–5.

[2] Louis André, *Michel Le Tellier et l'Organisation de l'Armée Monarchique*, Montpellier, 1906, 207–8.

" Je suis obligé de remarquer," he writes, " qu'il est presque impossible d'entreprendre avec succès de grandes guerres avec des François seuls. Les étrangers sont absolument nécessaires pour maintenir le corps des Armées et, si la cavalerie françoise est bonne pour combattre, on ne peut se passer de l'étrangère pour faire les gardes et supporter toutes les fatigues d'une armée. Notre nation bouillante et ardente aux combats n'est ni vigilante à se garder ni propre à former des desseins ou des entreprises qui ne se peuvent exécuter sans peine. Les armées françoises étoient toujours composées de la moitié d'étrangers, et nous avons expérimenté combien il est dangéreux d'en user autrement."[1]
Moreover, the system of enlisting troops in foreign countries was universal, and if France did not engage them, Spain would do so, and thereby gain an advantage over her enemy.[2]

The French Government had, therefore, a sufficient number of reasons for pursuing this policy. For the most part, it was in Germany and Switzerland that such soldiers of fortune were to be found ; but the various German States became increasingly unwilling to permit their subjects to transfer their services abroad. They required too many recruits themselves. The Swiss cantons also were alarmed at the trend of the war, and felt that at any time they might need to fight in self-defence. Hence levies had to be sought elsewhere, in Poland, in Italy, and among the Catalans.[3] Nor was it unnatural for Richelieu to direct his attention to Scotland, not only because of the ancient relations between the two countries, but also because of its attitude to this question of foreign enlistments.

It is not necessary to consider here the attitude of the authorities before 1625. Since that date there had been three definite periods in the policy of Charles I. and the Privy Council. Between 1625 and 1633 permission had been given for the enlisting of about 30,000 men, most of whom were destined for the armies of Denmark, Sweden, and the United

[1] Lavisse, *op. cit.*, VI. (ii), 318–9 ; Denis Avenel, *Lettres de Richelieu*, VI. 88–9, 138–41, 211–3, 238–40. These reveal Richelieu's interest in levies.
[2] Georges d'Avenel, *op. cit.*, III. 19–21.
[3] Lavisse, *op. cit.*, VI. (ii), 319.

Provinces. The second period extends from 1633 to 1637. During the preceding years the levies had all been intended for Protestant Powers. They continued to be supplied to Holland and Sweden ; but a new departure was taken in 1633 when troops were voted for Catholic France, which, however, was the ally of the Protestants. Since 1638 permission had been given to Alexander Erskine and to Lord Gray to raise regiments for France, but there is no record of troops being sent to other countries between that date and 1641. Hence, although, owing to the Bishops' War, the last two levies had not prospered, Richelieu would be encouraged by the policy of the Scottish authorities to seek for recruits beyond the Tweed.[1]

Particularly in 1641 was there every reason why he should be anxious to obtain new regiments. From 1638 to 1640 French arms had been favoured with almost unbroken success, but the campaign of 1641 proved disappointing. " In Italy and in Artois the French troops had enough to do to hold their own. Charles of Lorraine was restored to his Duchy, only to prove once more a traitor to his promises, and his Duchy had to be reoccupied before the year was over. In Germany Guébriant defeated the Imperialists at Wolfenbüttel, but the death of Baner and other causes prevented the allies from gaining any important results by their success." [2] During May and June of that year Montereul, the French *chargé d'affaires* in England, reported that the English and Scottish armies would probably soon be disbanded and that various Colonels were offering their services to France.[3] Thus conditions in Britain would seem to Richelieu to be favourable to his own requirements.

In July, 1641, therefore, Jacques d'Étampes, Marquis de la Ferté-Imbault, was sent to England as ambassador in

[1] *R.P.C. of Scot.* 2nd Series (1625–1643). I. ed. D. Masson; II–VII. ed. P. Hume Brown. See Indexes under " Soldiers."

[2] R. Lodge, *Richelieu*, Foreign Statesmen Series, 1908, 207–8.

[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 48, ff. 368, 382, 389.

ordinary.[1] Amongst his other duties he was instructed to do his utmost to obtain troops for France in England, in Ireland, and in Scotland. He was also to thwart similar endeavours on the part of Spanish agents in London. With his activities in regard to English and Irish recruits we are not concerned, nor even (at least directly) with his relations to Scottish officers such as Douglas, Fullerton, Lundy and Gray, whose names occur frequently in his correspondence. It is sufficient to note that the regiment of the Scottish Guards was only one of many which he endeavoured to raise.

He arrived in London on the 18th of July, and the events of the following autumn exercised an important influence upon the course of his negotiations. On the 10th of August the English Parliament concluded a definite settlement with the Scots,[2] and on the same day Charles left London for Edinburgh,[3] which he reached a few days later. His departure was looked upon with grave misgivings by the Commons of England, and it was only certain parties in Scotland who welcomed his arrival. Charles believed that with the support of the " Incendiaries " and the " Plotters " he might be able to utilise Scotland against the English Parliament, which by its actions in 1641 had so mortally offended him. He found, however, that the Covenanting party, headed by Argyle, was dominant in Parliament and the country. In these circumstances Charles granted to the Estates all that was demanded of him. But in return for all his concessions he did not obtain what he had hoped for. The effort of the Royalists to overthrow Argyle proved abortive (October 12, 1641). The power of the Covenanters was in fact increased; and Charles tried to gratify them by creating Leslie and Loudoun Earls and by making Argyle a Marquis. On the 28th of October he announced to the Parliament that he had received news of the Rebellion in Ireland, and

[1] C. H. Firth, *Notes on the Diplomatic Relations between France and England 1603–1688*, Oxford, 1906, 36.

[2] P. Hume Brown, *History of Scotland*, Cambridge Hist. Series, 1902, II. 321.

[3] *Political History of England*, VII. (Montague), 247.

on the 18th of November he left for London. After his departure from that city the Houses had adjourned, but on the 20th of October they had reassembled; and the anxiety with which they had contemplated his journey to the north was augmented by the tidings which came from Ireland. From the time of the King's return until August, 1642, events were gradually drifting towards civil war.

On the 3rd of October La Ferté wrote to Sublet de Noyers, the Minister of War:

"Le Comte de Argyle m'a écrit et fait écrire par le Lieutenant-Colonel du Baron de Londy qu'on serait bien aise en Écosse que le Roi voulût avoir un régiment écossais qui portât le titre de Régiment des Gardes écossaises. Le Comte de Argyle qui est celui qui gouverne tout en Écosse offre de le faire faire à son frère, de 4000 hommes, si l'on veut."[1] He wrote in a hopeful strain, but many months were to pass before everything was definitely settled, and the Ambassador frequently despaired of a successful termination to his efforts.

Before following their course, it is necessary to consider what were the obstacles to a more speedy conclusion. Argyle and La Ferté might wish such a regiment to be raised, but it was necessary to satisfy Charles, the Scottish Privy Council,[2] and the French Government of its desirability before anything could be effected. There were difficulties with each of the three parties. The King was not anxious to show unnecessary favours to Argyle, the extent of whose power in Scotland he had seen only too clearly. Much more important was the fact that, if he granted La Ferté's request, he would annoy the Spanish party, which was still fairly strong at the Court.[3] With the Scottish Privy Council the difficulties were even more numerous. It is true that, save for three regiments of foot and one of horse, the army had been disbanded.[4] Yet before it rose the Scottish Parliament had declared that no recruits were to be raised or sent abroad

[1] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 48, f. 431.

[2] The Estates rose on Nov. 17, 1641.

[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, ff. 152, 160.

[4] *A.P.S.*, V. 662b.

until an answer had been returned from the Diet at Ratisbon about the affairs of the Prince Palatine.[1] On the 12th of November it voted that 10,000 foot soldiers should be sent to Germany to assist him.[2] These troops were not sent, but this was only because of the outbreak of the Irish Rebellion. The Scottish nation was as interested in its progress as the English. There were many Scots in Ireland, and Charles was suspected of complicity in the affair. Hence when the English Parliament voted troops for the suppression of the revolt and expressed the hope that Scotland would come to its assistance, 10,000 men were offered for that purpose.[3] It proved no easy matter to fulfil the promise. Nor could the Council during the early months of 1642 fail to see that civil war appeared inevitable in England, and that in that war Scotland might ultimately be involved.[4] To permit recruits to be raised for France might offend the English Parliament, for the question of the levies was connected with a proposal to renew the old Franco-Scottish alliance on an even stronger basis.[5] Finally, there were the jealousies among the leading Scottish statesmen, which had been so obvious to Charles during his stay in Edinburgh, and which made some of them anxious to prevent an arrangement so favourable to the interests of Argyle.[6] Even the French Government displayed hesitation and reluctance. It had, indeed, commissioned La Ferté to undertake such a task, but it was not willing to accept troops on conditions which it considered disadvantageous and onerous. Yet precisely because of the obstacles which the Ambassador met with, he was inclined to grant very favourable terms to Kintyre, the brother of Argyle.[7]

Fortunately, however, there were weighty reasons to impel the King, the Privy Council, and the French Government to acquiesce. Charles might hope by yielding to gain the

[1] *Ibid.*, V. 349.
[2] *Ibid.*, V. 385.
[3] *R.P.C. of Scot.*, 2nd Series, VII. ed. P. Hume Brown, xxii–ix.
[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 9. Jan. 16, 1642.
[5] *Ibid.*, f. 35. Feb. 13, 1642. La Ferté on English fears regarding Franco-Scottish Alliance.
[6] *Ibid.*, f. 19. Jan. 30, 1642.
[7] *Ibid.*, f. 17. Jan. 23, 1642; f. 19. Jan. 30, 1642.

Scottish Covenanters to his side. If they refused to assist him, even after this further proof of his good intentions, he would at least have got rid of possible enemies. The greater the number of recruits the better for him. This was a point of view which Richelieu had suggested some years before to Bellièvre.[1] To the Privy Council it must have been obvious that if Scotland were eventually involved in the approaching civil war, French help might be very valuable. It would be inexpedient, therefore, to disoblige the Government of France. Even if the future proved less clouded than their fears anticipated, Richelieu would be more inclined to restore the ancient privileges of Scots in France if his wishes as to recruits received favourable consideration.[2] Moreover, the existence of such a regiment would provide honourable occupation for the sons of noble houses, and it would enable the Council to expatriate some of the numerous vagabonds who constituted a danger to the public peace.[3] To the French Government La Ferté pointed out that as the sons of the nobles would take positions as captains and lieutenants in the regiment, there would be little difficulty in obtaining recruits for it in the future. The captains of the various companies would receive an excellent training so as to become capable of higher commands should France wish to raise fresh regiments in Scotland at some later time.[4]

The course of the prolonged negotiations of the French ambassador may now be briefly traced. In reply to Argyle's letter La Ferté wrote on the 21st of November, begging him to send either Kintyre, his brother, or a nobleman who was with him and who was known to the Ambassador. With Argyle's envoy he would be able to discuss the whole question in detail.[5] Before the end of the year he heard that in answer to his request Kintyre and Lundy were to be sent to London

[1] Denis Avenel, *Lettres, etc., de Richelieu*, VI. 211–13.
[2] *R.P.C. of Scot.*, 2nd Series, VII. Introd. lxiii–lxv.
[3] *Ibid.*, 330, 417.
[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 19.
[5] *Ibid.*, 48, f. 492. Argyle had written before October 3. La Ferté's delay in replying was due to the political circumstances of Scotland and Ireland in October and November.

(December 26, 1641).[1] In addition a certain number of Deputies were coming from Edinburgh to confer with the English Parliament concerning the Irish Rebellion and the means to be taken for its suppression.[2] One of them was to be Lothian, and Argyle had commissioned them all, but Lothian in particular, to enter into negotiations with La Ferté both as to the levies and as to a renewal of the old alliance.[3] On the 23rd of January the Ambassador was able to announce to Sublet de Noyers that after a long conference with Lothian and Lundy an agreement had been come to about the Scottish Guards.[4] Kintyre had not accompanied them, and Imbault sent a courier to Scotland in Lundy's company to obtain a ratification of the treaty.[5] The Deputies also sent an account of their resolutions to Edinburgh. Their attitude had been extremely encouraging, for they virtually promised that troops would be supplied whether the King gave his consent or not.[6] Before the 13th of February word came to London that the matter was progressing favourably in the Scottish capital and that Kintyre was coming south. He arrived before the end of the month, and the capitulation was signed by him and the Ambassador on the 27th.[7] After all, Charles proved friendly to the desires of France, and on the 2nd of March his consent was given,[8] much to the delight of the leading men in Scotland.[9] On the 22nd of March La Ferté wrote to Noyers that the levies were progressing.[10]

He was indeed hopeful that his treaty would find favour with the authorities in Paris. Nevertheless, he was less sanguine in March than he had been in the previous December.

[1] *Ibid.*, f. 502.
[2] *Ibid.*, f. 499. Dec. 4, 1641; *R.P.C. of Scot.*, 2nd Series, VII. Introd. xxiii.
[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 9.
[4] *Ibid.*, f. 17.
[5] *Ibid.*, f. 19.
[6] *Ibid.*, f. 17.
[7] *Dépôt de la Guerre MSS.*, 71, Expéditions de l'Année 1642. Feb. 27, 1642. See *post*, Appendix B.
[8] *R.P.C. of Scot.*, 2nd Series, VII. 247–48.
[9] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 56.
[10] *Ibid.*, f. 66.

He had kept the Minister of War in close touch with the development of affairs, and in January he had sent him a copy of the treaty which Lothian and he had agreed upon.[1] But no response had been given to the numerous letters which he wrote asking for Noyers' decision, and requesting that, if it was favourable, commissions and money might be forwarded.[2] This prolonged silence was not easy to interpret, but it did not seem to imply much enthusiasm. In spite of this, La Ferté had signed the treaty along with Kintyre.[3] The dispositions of Scottish statesmen were far from being constant, and he felt that a temporary delay might ruin his enterprise. It would be unfortunate if Louis XIII. and Richelieu objected to his treaty, but it would be still worse if their consent came too late.

Noyers' letter at length arrived, and the ambassador replied to it on the 27th of March.[4] He had been greatly embarrassed by its injunctions. The Minister of War announced that there were four articles of the treaty which neither the King nor the Cardinal was willing to accept. He seemed to be under the impression that the other regiments could be raised and that the treaty as to the Guards might be refused. La Ferté made it clear that this was to misunderstand the whole situation. Not a single man would be transported from Scotland if Argyle, Leslie, and the Chancellor did not grant their permission. To offend Argyle would put a stop to all the levies, and the Marquis was not the person speedily to forget such a slight. Louis and Richelieu thought that undue liberties in the exercise of the Protestant religion had been granted to the Guards, and they did not approve of the power given to the Colonel to appoint the Captains of the companies. La Ferté was not ready to admit that in granting such privileges he had conceded more than was usual in the case of foreign Colonels. Nevertheless, if the Government would agree to the other conditions, he would try to

[1] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 17. Jan. 23, 1642.
[2] *Ibid.*, f. 35, f. 66.
[3] *Ibid.*, f. 35. Feb. 13, 1642.
[4] *Ibid.*, f. 68.

realise their wishes in regard to the two in question. He would make a verbal promise to the Scots about their religious privileges, and he would endeavour to obtain for the French King the power to dispose of the companies.

The task to which he now addressed himself was not a pleasant one. It was three days before he could resolve to approach Kintyre and the Scottish Deputies on the subject. After a six days' discussion he persuaded Kintyre to agree to the requisite changes.[1] As it was, he felt that if the difficulties had been made at the commencement of the negotiations, no treaty would have been signed. The Privy Council, however, on the 24th of April, authorised the levying of men for the Guards.[2] By this time La Ferté was again impatient at the silence of Sublet de Noyers, who had not yet sent his approval of the treaty. Kintyre, now Earl of Irvine,[3] did not wait for its arrival, but proceeded to Scotland along with Lundy. At last, after more than a month, came the official permission, and commissions were sent for various officers (June 5, 1642).[4] Without these commissions the officers would not embark any of their soldiers, and the delay in transmitting them had been another source of irritation to the French ambassador.

The terms of the treaty thus agreed upon seem to have been considered sufficiently favourable by the authorities in Scotland. What position in the French army did they secure to the Scottish Guards? The answer to this question involves a consideration of the position of French and foreign

[1] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 81. April 10, 1642.

[2] *R.P.C. of Scot.*, 2nd Series, VII. 147–8. Presumably it was aware of the fact that Irvine had agreed to changes in the original treaty. For Argyle, writing on May 8 to "Les Seigneurs d'Écosse," says: "Ayant su que le Roi de France l'entretiendrait avec tous les honneurs, privilèges, et bénéfices que les Gardes françaises et suisses ont, comme aussi avec le pouvoir et plein exercice de leur religion sans empêchement." . . . Now the commanders of the "Gardes françaises et suisses" had *not* the power to nominate captains. The sentence about religion seems to imply ignorance of the changes on which Imbault had successfully insisted, but Argyle may have been content with the verbal assurance in this connection. (*Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 113.)

[3] Kintyre had been created Earl of Irvine on March 28, 1642. See *Corr. of the Earls of Ancrum and Lothian*, Edin. 1875. I. 138–9; *Scots Peerage*, ed. Balfour Paul, Edin. 1908, I. 350.

[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 130, June 5, 1642.

troops with respect to the four following points:—(1) pay, arms, clothing, and food ; (2) powers granted to officers in command of regiments ; (3) supervision exercised by the State over officers in command of regiments ; (4) rank of regiments.

(1) A "*Mestre de Camp*" [1] received from 500 to 600 livres at each "*montre*," [2] and often (in theory) an additional pension of from 2,000 to 3,000 livres a year. A colonel [3] obtained 500 livres a "*montre*," and the lieut.-colonel the half of that sum. A captain, whether in a French or a foreign regiment, was paid 300 livres a "*montre*," a lieutenant a third of that amount. The common soldier, Frenchman or foreigner, received generally 12 livres a month. The "*prime d'engagement*" (the money given to each man, officer or soldier, at the time of levying), was, for French troops, 12 livres. The members of the Gardes Françaises obtained 20 livres. Foreign volunteers sometimes received as much as 18, but in general they were treated like French soldiers. The Swiss Guards were in the same position as the French Guards. For French troops the number of "*montres*" had been reduced first from ten to eight annually ; and towards the close of Louis XIII.'s reign, it was common to give payment only four or five times a year. A certain amount was struck off the annual total "*sous prétexte des ausmosnes*." But the capitulations of foreign colonels included the stipulation that there should be no such "*rabais*," and the promise to pay every 36 days was generally one of the treaty articles.

Commanders of French regiments had to furnish arms and clothing out of the pay of the soldiers. The latter paid for their food also, with the exception of the "*pain de munition*" which was provided by the State. Colonels did not supply their regiments with arms, but on the other hand the State did not provide foreign volunteers with "*pain de munition*."

(2) In general, French regiments were of two kinds: a few of ancient standing, permanent, and of considerable

[1] "Mestre de Camp" was the title for the commanding officer of a French regiment.

[2] The review at which the payments were made.

[3] The title of the commander of a foreign regiment.

size; a great many of recent creation, temporary, and of varying size. The powers of the "*Mestres de Camp*" in the two classes were rather different. Those of the latter class were able to appoint their captains and other officers, but the King could demand that fit men should receive the posts. Appointments in the former class were in the power of the crown. The civil authorities were gradually encroaching on the judicial privileges of military officials, and those the latter still possessed were subject to the control of the Colonel-General of the Infantry. The Gardes Françaises appear to have been an exception to this rule. Foreign colonels, on the other hand, had extensive powers of justice; but there were certain cases which they were not competent to deal with, and there were certain crimes which it was not in their choice to leave unpunished. They could nominate the captains of their companies, but thereafter the names were submitted to the Government which issued the necessary commissions.

(3) The frauds which were practised on the State by "*Mestres de Camp*" and captains were numerous. A "*Mestre de Camp*," for example, might receive the "*prime*" for a greater number of men than he had levied, and those whom he did recruit might be very inferior and practically useless. Sometimes he paid men less than the Government allowance, and by presenting at the "*montres*" pretended or borrowed soldiers, he would obtain for the payment of his troops an excessive sum of money. The State was bound, therefore, in self-defence to adopt various means of supervision. The sum total necessary for the "*prime*" was handed over only after the arrival of the recruits at the appointed rendezvous, and the "*Commissaire à la conduite*" could refuse to accept the physically unfit. The payment of the troops came to be entrusted, first, to the "*Commissaires des Guerres*" and then to the "*Intendants d'Armée*." Foreign Colonels were subjected to practically the same supervision as the "*Mestres de Camp*."

(4) In the hierarchy of regiments the first places were occupied by the French and the Swiss Guards. The former

was a large regiment of 30 companies, each containing 200 men. Then came the four old regiments which had existed for a hundred years—Picardy, Piémont, Champagne, and Navarre. Next to these privileged troops were classed the regiments "*entre-tenus à conduite*," later named "*les petits vieux*," Normandie, Ile-de-France, and seven others. The "Régiments de Province à Drapeaux blancs" occupied a position between "*les petits vieux*," and the large number of recent creations of various sizes which were at the base of the scale. Foreign regiments had no place of honour allotted to them unless the same was stipulated in the capitulation or granted later as the reward for distinguished service.[1]

It will be seen from this analysis that in regard to the first and second points the advantage lay, on the whole, with the foreign regiments; as to the third, French and foreign officers were on an equal footing; while in respect of rank the honours lay with the home regiments. The Scottish Guards were to receive the same pay as other foreign troops, except that, as in the French and Swiss Guards, the "*prime*" was to be 20 livres for each man. Besides, payment was to be made in Scotland, and the Colonel was to give sufficient caution for reimbursement if he failed to transport the stipulated number of men. He was not to have the power to nominate captains because this privilege was not accorded to the most important French regiments. His men were to enjoy certain religious privileges, although this was only verbally promised. The Scottish Guards would be maintained in times of peace as well as of war, and were thus to be treated like the chief French regiments. The place assigned to

[1] Sources of information are:—
(1) Georges d'Avenel, *Richelieu et la Monarchie Absolue*, III. 7, 13, 69–70, 71, 73, 84–5, 127–30; L. André, *Michel Le Tellier et l'Organisation de l'Armée Monarchique*, 221–4, 271–80, 331, 350; Lavisse, *op. cit.*, VI. (ii), 322–3.
(2) Georges d'Avenel, *op. cit.*, III. 6, 12, 30–1, 33–4, 60–63, 110–11; L. André, *op. cit.*, 221–4; *Dépôt de la Guerre MSS.*, 14, f. 49, Capitulation with Sir J. Hepburn, Mar. 6, 1633.
(3) Georges d'Avenel, *op. cit.*, III. 8, 12, 32, 55–6, 145–7; L. André, *op. cit.*, 326–8; Lavisse, *op. cit.*, VI. (ii), 327, 324.
(4) Georges d'Avenel, *op. cit.*, III. 30–4; *Dépôt de la Guerre MSS.*, 14, f. 171, rank given to Hepburn's regiment, July 25, 1637.

them in the hierarchy was an eminent one, as they were to march after the French and Swiss Guards. Whatever honours these two regiments enjoyed were to be shared by the Scots. One company would always be about the person of the King, and the regiment would have the right to wear a uniform.[1]

As we have seen, Irvine started for Scotland and proceeded with the levying even before the arrival of Noyers' consent to the treaty, and it was not until after the beginning of June, 1642, that the officers received their legal nomination. Moray was appointed Lieut.-Colonel, probably on account of his past record in the French service.[2] Argyle displayed considerable zeal in furthering the levies. He wrote to the Lords of Scotland on the 8th of May and solicited their help for Irvine and his officers.[3] In June he addressed a letter to the Laird of Kilravock, from whom he hoped for recruits for the company of his son, Lord Lorne.[4] But the process of levying proved slower than La Ferté could have wished. Early in July he was told that the greater part of the Guards would be in France before the end of the month, and that all would have arrived by the last day of August.[5] By this date, however, only 1,500 men had been embarked.[6] What number eventually did reach their destination it is impossible to state. La Ferté left England in September, and on the 23rd of October, in a letter to Lothian, he referred to the necessity of obtaining permission in Scotland "*de faire passer les six compagnies*

[1] *Dépôt de la Guerre MSS.*, 71. Expéditions de l'Année 1642, Feb. 27, 1642. Capitulation between La Ferté and Kintyre. See *post*, App. B.

[2] *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, March, 1859. A French bond of April, 1643, signed by some of the officers. The list may be incomplete:—" Jacques, Comte de Yrwin; Le Chevalier Robert Moray, Lieutenant-Colonel; Le Chevalier Bannatyne, premier capitaine; Sergent Major, le milord Lorne, le milord Kelpont, le milord Salton, le Milord Sintcolme; les Chevaliers Keith G. Hamilton, Grahame, Jacques Hamilton, Blaicketer, Jean Trail, Guillaume Moray, Robert Hacquet; les chevaliers Colin Campbell, Jos. Douglas, G. Currer; Colin Campbell, Gui. Stuart, G. Gordon, Jacques MacMath, Jean Lesley; le Milord Sinclair; estans tous capitaines du dict régiment écossais."

[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 113.

[4] J. Willcock, *The Great Marquess*, Edin., 1903, Appendix.

[5] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 152, f. 160. July 4 and 10, 1642.

[6] *Ibid.*, ff. 176, 177.

restantes." [1] The regiment was "*en assez mauvais état,*" 600 or 700 men being scattered over Champagne. Sir Richard Brown, British Ambassador at Paris, writing to Nicholas on January 13/23, 1643, stated that only 2,000 of the Guards had arrived, whereas 4,500 was the intended number. In the other Scottish regiments also there was a large deficit.[2] An order of the Privy Council of the 29th of March implies that recruiting was still going on ; [3] and this is in harmony with the fact that on the 1st of April only 22 captains seem to have been in France.[4] By that time, however, both the Colonel and Moray, the Lieut.-Colonel, had arrived. The latter had been knighted by Charles I. in Oxford on the 10th of January.[5]

Not only were the numbers deficient, but the type of men who were being enlisted was not such as a modern State would want to recruit.[6] The Lords of the Council gave warrant " to all sheriffs, stewards, baillies of regalities, and their deputies, provosts and baillies of burghs, and others his Majesty's officers and ministers of his laws to burgh and land to take and apprehend all such idle persons and vagabonds as shall be given up to be of that quality by the ministers and kirk-sessions and magistrates of burghs within their several jurisdictions." (Sept. 29, 1642.)

The difficulty which seems to have been experienced by the recruiting officers was probably greatly increased by the

[1] *Corr. of the Earls of Ancrum and Lothian*, I. 138–9.

[2] *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn*, ed. H. Wheatley, 1906, IV. 331–2.

[3] *R.P.C. of Scot.*, 2nd Series, VII. 417.

[4] *Cf. ante*, p. 24, *n.* 2.

[5] W. Shaw, *Knights of England*, 1906, II. 215. There was a Robert Moray knighted on that day who was probably the subject of this biography. He was a Chevalier in 1645 before he left the Continent to return to Britain. The R. Murray mentioned in the Acts of the Parl. of Scot., Nov. 5, 1641, was not a knight, but he was probably Moray. Between 1641–1645 there does not appear to have been any Moray knighted other than the one who received the honour on Jan. 10, 1643. As Kintyre had been made Earl of Irvine, it is very likely that the Lieut.-Colonel was also honoured. So many of the Captains were Lords or Knights that it was clearly desirable for the Lieut.-Colonel to have some title.

[6] *R.P.C. of Scot.*, 2nd Series, VII. 330.

trend of events both in England and Scotland from August 1642 onwards. On the 22nd of August the Civil War began, and the Scottish nation had to decide on its course of action. In November the English Parliament sought the help of the northern country, and in December the King made a similar request. The Privy Council on the whole favoured the King; but neither the Commissioners of the General Assembly nor the Committee of the Estates were of the same inclination. Early in 1643 it was clear that Scotland was likely to interfere actively on the side which so far had proved the weaker.[1]

During June, July and August, 1642, La Ferté had repeatedly impressed upon the French Government the necessity of treating the Scots well as they arrived at Dieppe. If his advice was not followed the enthusiasm of the Scots for the French service would be greatly lessened.[2] But the Ambassador's counsels and warnings were disregarded. As early as the 31st of October, 1642, he had to reassure Lothian that the French Government would adhere to its engagements.[3] It is very improbable that the authorities in France were annoyed at the type of men who were being transported. French recruiting officers were not very careful as to whom they engaged. Escaped criminals were taken if they had the necessary physical qualities, sturdy bodies and good eyes. The soldiers, often unpaid, lived by begging and robbing, and this kind of life practically required that they should be coarse-grained and devoid of conscience.[4] Noyers would lay much more stress on the fact that numerically the levies were deficient. But this is neither a sufficient explanation of the treatment of the Guards nor an adequate excuse for it. It was only too common for the French Government to fall short of its promises, and even before La Ferté left England he had deceived Irvine.[5] Moreover, if the recruits arrived

[1] P. Hume Brown, *Hist. of Scot.*, II. 326–8.
[2] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, ff. 152, 164.
[3] *Corr. of Earls of Ancrum and Lothian*, I. 139–140.
[4] Lavisse, *op. cit.*, VI. (ii), 317–29.
[5] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 130. June 5, 1642. "Je ne mande point au Comte de Kintyre le changement que vous avez fait dans son traité, me promettant qu'avant qu'il parte, je le verrai et lui ferai consentir pour ce que

slowly, this may have been partly due to rumours of ill-treatment by the officials in France.[1]

The two chief complaints of the officers of the Scottish Guards were that they and their men were not being paid, and that the regiment had not received its due rank. There is adequate proof that both complaints were amply justified. The bond of the 1st of April, to which allusion has already been made,[2] was a promise to repay a Scottish merchant in Paris money which the officers had been forced to borrow because their pay was in arrears. It is noteworthy that a Swiss regiment was in a similar plight at the same time.[3] Before he left England, La Ferté had requested Sublet de Noyers to send Irvine a brevet assuring him of the rank of his regiment, seeing that the capitulation had been signed only by Kintyre and the Ambassador.[4] If Irvine felt uncertain about the matter his fears were in accordance with what actually happened. For at some date anterior to the 14th of April, 1643, the King ordered that the Scottish Guards should march after the regiment of Picardy.[5] It is very doubtful also whether the promise that one of the companies should be in attendance on the King was ever fulfilled. According to Daniel: "Le titre de Régiment des Gardes qu'on donna à ce régiment fut, je crois, purement un titre d'honneur; car je ne trouve nulle part qu'il en ait exercé les fonctions ordinaires ni qu'il se fût jamais fait aucun règlement à cet égard." [6]

The course which the officers followed in order to obtain their rights was not, however, one which can be justified. According to the letters of the Duc d'Enghien, the commander of the army of Picardy, and therefore of the Scottish Guards,

---

vous m'écrivez dans la vôtre touchant son état-major; je n'ai pas cru lui devoir mander, appréhendant que cela ne peust donner quelque dégoût à cette nation, leur faisant voir que l'on veut retrancher quelque chose de ce que l'on leur a promis."

[1] *Ibid.*, f. 144. June 19, 1642.

[2] See *ante*, p. 24, *n.* 2.

[3] Duc d'Aumale, *Histoire des Princes de Condé*, Paris, 1886. IV. 482–5.

[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 49, f. 160. July 10, 1642.

[5] Duc d'Aumale, *op. cit.*, IV. 472, 484.

[6] Gabriel Daniel, *Histoire de la Milice Française*, Paris, 1721, II. 327–9.

they left Amiens, their "*lieu d'assemblée*," and made for the capital, without having obtained leave to go. They arrived in Paris before the middle of April. They stated that if their grievances were not redressed they would request permission to quit the service. The Swiss officers were also in Paris demanding arrears of pay. Both Scots and Swiss declared that the death of Louis XIII. would free them from their oath of obedience and service.[1] By some means or other they were deterred from an extreme course of action, for the Regiment of the Guards took part in the campaign of 1643, although it was August before the officers obtained satisfaction.[2]

In the earlier part of the campaign of 1643 the Scottish Guards served under the Duc d'Enghien,[3] later known as "The Great Condé," one of the greatest generals of the century, and took part in important and successful encounters. They formed part of the second line of the French centre at the battle of Rocroy where, on the 18th of May, the Duke inflicted a crushing defeat on Don Francisco Melo, the Governor of the Spanish Netherlands.[4] They were present at the attack on Thionville in the following month, suffered in the first attempt to carry the outer works by storm,[5] and shared in the protracted siege of the town which did not fall until the 10th of August. In the later stages of the campaign, under less distinguished chiefs, they met with disaster. The French army operating in Western Germany under Guébriant had been driven across the Rhine,[6] and Mazarin, Richelieu's successor, at length

[1] Duc d'Aumale, *op. cit.*, IV. 39, 472, 485.

[2] *Dépôt de la Guerre MSS.*, 79, ff. 64–6, Aug. 2, 1643. On August 14, 1643, La Ferté-Imbault, formerly French Ambassador in England, was appointed Colonel-General of the Scottish Regiments by Le Tellier, the new War-Minister (*Ibid.*, f. 178). There was already a Colonel-General for the Swiss, and the office was considered useful as a means of obtaining an indirect hold upon the foreign troops whose motive for fighting was self-interest alone.

[3] His appointment at the age of twenty-two as commander of the army in Picardy was one of the last acts of Richelieu, who died on December 4, 1642. By the death of his father in December, 1646, he became Prince de Condé.

[4] Duc d'Aumale, *op. cit.*, IV. 81–3; *Le Mercure de France*, XXV. (i), 8–17.

[5] *Le Mercure de France*, XXV. (i), 34. "Le capitaine Toul" (*sic*), "écossais, fut tué d'une mousquetade en cette occasion avec quatre soldats des gardes écossaises, dont le Major fut blessé d'un éclat de bombe."

[6] E. Charvériat, *Histoire de la Guerre de Trente Ans*, Paris, 1878, II. 473–5.

yielded to the General's appeal for reinforcements. As the campaign was regarded with aversion by French troops, it was resolved that the greater part of the reinforcements should be foreign soldiers.[1] Among them were the Scottish Guards, who joined Guébriant's army towards the end of October.[2] Thus reinforced, Guébriant crossed the Rhine on the 1st of November, and captured the town of Rottweil, which commanded the communications between the Rhine and the Danube. Guébriant, however, was mortally wounded during the siege, and the march towards Tüttlingen, a small town on the right bank of the Danube, was carried out under Rantzau, a German of extreme insolence and boastfulness, whose advancement to the position of Lieut.-General the older leaders could hardly tolerate.[3] Unknown to the French, the Imperial forces under Mercy had been joined by those of the Duke of Lorraine. On the 24th of November the combined armies issued unexpectedly from the forests surrounding Tüttlingen and fell upon the French, who were completely defeated. In all, 8 generals, 9 *mestres de camp* and colonels, 12 staff officers, and 7,000 men were taken prisoners, while 4,000 were killed or wounded. Of the Scottish Guards Sir Robert Moray, the Lieut.-Colonel, two captains, two lieutenants and three minor officers were captured,[4] and conducted to Ingolstadt in Bavaria. A portion, at least, of Sir Robert's period of imprisonment was spent in this town, not unpleasantly, it would appear. He was the favourite of a Jesuit who lent him Kircherus' book on Magnetism, and he had some correspondence with the author.[5]

[1] Duc d'Aumale, *op. cit.*, IV. 230; P.R.O., *Foreign S.P., France*, No. CXI. Nov. 6, 1643. "The most part of these succours is composed of strangers, the cause whereof I take to be a natural aversion the French have to go into Germany" (Sir R. Brown).

[2] P.R.O., *Foreign S.P., France*, No. CXI. Dec. 15/25, 1643.

[3] Duc d'Aumale, *op. cit.*, IV. 236–243; J. Le Laboureur, *Histoire du Maréchal de Guébriant*, folio, Paris, 1657, VII. 684 *et seq.*

[4] J. Heilmann, *Die Feldzüge von Bayern in 1643–5*, Leipzig, 1851, 76. *Cf. M.C.*, II. 564.

[5] *Kincardine Papers* (Douglas Transcripts): Moray to Kincardine, Ap. 5/15, 1658. For Kircherus see *post*, Chap. VIII.

There seemed little prospect of him regaining his freedom. France either could not or would not agree to an exchange of prisoners, and the condition of the finances made it impossible for Le Tellier to advance money for the ransom of captive officers. But the unexpected happened, and Moray was at liberty before the 28th of April, 1645.[1] His ransom, £16,500 (Scots), was paid by a Robert Murray who was a merchant in Paris.[2] The Lieut.-Colonel bound himself to repay the money before the 1st of July, "with annual rent during the not payment." John, Earl of Crawford-Lindsay, "did with the advice of the Earls Cassilis, Lauderdale, Lanark, and of the Lords Balmerino and Burghlie, engage himself for payment of the foresaid sum."[3]

It is not quite certain why Sir Robert was liberated at this time.[4] He was never again on active service for France. But his connection with the army of that country was not yet ended, and even the diplomatic work on which he was soon to engage would, if it were successful, subserve her military aims.

[1] Other prisoners were less fortunate. *Cf. Mémoires de la Vie de Claude de Letouf, Baron de Sirot*, Paris, 1683, II. 71, 118–29; *Mémoires du Sieur de Pontis*, Paris, 1837, 2nd ser. VI. 633–650.

[2] Later Sir Robert Murray of Cameron and Priestfield (see *post*, Chap. VII., p. 127, *n.* 1). See also *Transactions of the Society of Antiquaries of Scot.*, March 1859,.

[3] *A.P.S.*, VI. (i), 597.

[4] *Cf. post*, Chap. III., pp. 32–3.

CHAPTER III

1645–1651

DIPLOMACY AND POLITICS

When Moray left for France in the spring of 1643, it was evident that the Scots were tending towards an alliance with the English Parliament. Within a year the Solemn League and Covenant was made between the two parties, and the Scottish army began to enter England on the 19th of January, 1644. So long as the Civil War lasted the alliance proved useful to the English Parliament. But with the defeat of Charles at Naseby (June 13, 1645), the need of harmony diminished, and the English Parliament began to show its hostility to the conditions upon which the Scots had given assistance. The Independents did not wish the establishment of the Presbyterian system in England, and even the English Presbyterians were not quite in agreement with the Scots as to the kind of Presbyterianism to be set up.

Such relations between the victorious allies were calculated to improve the position of the King. Mazarin, the chief French Minister, was no less anxious than Charles to make use of this new turn of affairs. He was considerably alarmed at the success of the English Parliament, and he feared the establishment of a Republic in England. The monarchy must be preserved, and yet it must not be too powerful. Charles, therefore, must be induced to come to terms with the Scots and with the English Presbyterians. One party would have to yield in regard to religion, or both would require to enter into a compromise; which of these courses was followed the Cardinal did not care.

Sabran, the French Ambassador in England, had proved his inability to conduct a difficult negotiation. Mazarin, therefore, chose a fresh mind for the new task, and dispatched

Montereul to England at the end of July, 1645. He was sent nominally as an agent to the Scottish Government and its Commissioners in London; his real business could not be made public.[1]

Soon after his arrival he entered into relations with Sir Robert Moray, who was to play a very important part in the subsequent negotiations. It has been seen that Sir Robert was at liberty by the 28th of April, 1645;[2] but it is rather difficult to determine the relation between his deliverance from captivity and the work to which he gave his attention on regaining his freedom. Was his ransom paid in order that he might be useful to the Scottish Commissioners in probable negotiations? During the summer and autumn of 1644 Sabran had tried to dissociate the Scots from the English Parliament, but he had failed as they would not abandon the Covenant.[3] Yet in October, 1644, Sir Thomas Dishington was in Paris, proposing to save the King by means of the old Franco-Scottish alliance.[4] "He wishes" wrote Du Bosc to the Cardinal, "to obtain the release of Sir Robert Moray . . . prisoner of the Duke of Bavaria, who will be of great service."[5] Dishington's proposals seem incompatible with the contemporary attitude of the Scottish Commissioners in London to the suggestions of Sabran, and it is impossible to say on whose authority he made them. But during the winter of 1644–45 the Scots in London may have become conscious of the probability of

[1] S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of the Great Civil War*, 1898 edn., II. 339.

Jean de Montereul had been in England before. He was Secretary to Bellièvre during the years when the latter was French Ambassador in England (Sept. 1638—Feb. 1640), and he remained in the country until June 27, 1641. Before his second visit to England, as also before his first one, he acted as Secretary to French ambassadors in Rome. Through the influence of Cardinal Antoine whom he met there, he was named a Canon of Toul, a cathedral city in Lorraine. From the autumn of 1645 till the autumn of 1648 he lived mostly in Britain, as French agent to the Scottish Government. After his return to Paris, he became Secretary to the Prince de Conti, and a member of the French Academy (1649). He played a part of some note in the Fronde, but before that movement was over he died on April 27, 1651, at the age of thirty-seven. (See J. Fotheringham: Introd. to *Montereul Correspondence*, xvii–xxvi; Scot. Hist. Socy., 1898.)

[2] See *ante*, Chapter II, p. 30.

[3] Ranke, *History of England*, II. 455–57, V. App., 472–79.

[4] *M.C.*, xiv., xv.

[5] *M.C.*, II. 564.

future trouble with their allies, and Moray's release may have been due to this foresight on their part.

In any case, he was in London early in the autumn of 1645, in close touch and in high favour with Montereul. The French Agent had not been three months in London before he had come to an understanding with the Scottish Commissioners. It is unlikely that he would have been so fortunate but for the supposed actions of the Independents and the real doings of the English Parliament. The Scots, like Lord Holland, a leader of the English Presbyterians, believed that the Independents were negotiating with the King, and they dreaded the results of such a union. The House of Commons " treated Leven's troops as hired auxiliaries, who were expected to obey orders without question." They complained of the devastations which the Scots had committed in the northern counties, forgetting their own neglect to send pay to Leven's army. Finally, they did not manifest any keen desire for agreement about peace propositions to be sent to the King.[1]

Hence, on the 17th of October, Montereul received the conditions upon which the Scottish Commissioners were willing to make peace with their sovereign. Charles was to agree to establish ecclesiastical affairs according to what would be resolved on in the Parliaments and Assemblies of the two kingdoms, and according to the practice of the other Reformed Churches. In that case Loudoun and Balmerino believed that the Scots and the well-intentioned among the English would act together. They would take every care to secure that the King should have the nomination of half of those to whom the charge of the Militia would be confided. As to delinquents, none of them would suffer any serious inconvenience ; five or six would have to withdraw from the country for some time. The arrangement of all other civil affairs of England, Ireland, and Scotland, would be left to the King and the Parliaments of the two realms. If the King should agree to the above scheme, he was to send a message to both Parliaments offering to make peace. Then the Scots would try to

[1] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 1–3.

secure the agreement of the English Parliament, and, if they failed, they would employ the promptest means to obtain peace and the preservation of the King.[1]

After Montereul and Moray had made ciphered copies of the paper which contained these terms, they returned the original to Balmerino and Loudoun, who feared the possibility of exposure.[2] They had acted on their own initiative in the matter, and the Scottish Parliament was not implicated by what they had done. Loudoun appears to have expressed the conviction that the Estates would approve of the proposals and to have suggested that he would soon journey to Edinburgh to make sure about the point.[3] This was not promised, however, in the paper which Montereul received.

Thus it was the King who would have to yield to the Scots in the matter of religion. Hence the Commissioners felt that the support of Henrietta Maria ought to be gained for their plan before it was submitted to Charles.[4] The Queen Regent of France would also be asked to act as surety to the contracting parties for their mutual good faith. Either Montereul or Moray could undertake this business, but for various reasons it was the latter who was chosen. If Montereul left for France suspicion might be aroused, but this would not be so likely if Moray went. Irvine, the Colonel of the Scottish Guards, had recently died; and if Sir Robert journeyed to Paris it would be supposed that he went to look after his personal interests. The Countess of Devonshire had recommended him "as one capable of conducting a transaction such as we have in hand," and the Scottish Commissioners had "the greatest confidence in him."[5]

On arriving in Paris, the Scottish envoy requested Mazarin to persuade the Queen Regent to become surety to Charles for the fulfilment by the Scots of their promises, as well as to

[1] *M.C.*, II. 571–2.
[2] Montereul and Moray tried to give a certain authenticity to the copies (see *M.C.*, I. 36). But Mazarin's instructions to Bellièvre (June, 1646) make it clear that they did not succeed. (Ranke, *op. cit.*, V. 487–88.)
[3] *M.C.*, II. 570.
[4] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 4.
[5] *M.C.*, I. 13–17.

the Scots for the performance by Charles of his engagements.[1] The chief difficulty of his mission was to obtain the consent of the English Queen to the Scottish terms. At first matters seemed to be promising: Jermyn agreed that it was high time for Charles to think of separating his interests from his hopes regarding the Bishops, and Mazarin was also satisfied about the terms relating to religion.[2] By the 27th of November, however, Moray had to report to the Commissioners in a less jubilant strain. Henrietta had not agreed to the Scottish suggestions about religion. There was a project to settle that difficulty by means of an Assembly of the clergy belonging to all the Churches of Europe. Therefore, he would probably return with unsatisfactory replies and awkward counter-demands. But he hoped to achieve something, and if the bad news about the royal cause which had come from England had its proper effect on the Queen, he might yet be completely successful. If she remained obdurate, it would not be for lack of persuasion on the Cardinal's part.[3]

Nine days later Moray arrived in London, but his news was disappointing.[4] In point of fact, however, the Queen had been more pliable than he was aware. She had yielded to Mazarin's persuasion, and had agreed to write to Charles. She would bid him accept the Scottish demands, "when it would be seen to be impossible to agree without giving them this satisfaction." He was even to be advised to consent to the retirement for a time of three or four persons, Montrose excepted. Mazarin had not informed Moray of this, because Henrietta Maria had forbidden him to do so. But he told Montereul in a letter of the 1st of December, and he added that the French envoy was to try to reduce the Scottish demands as much as he could. This was the Queen's wish, and she also desired him to go to Oxford, where he would deliver her letters to Charles. The Cardinal ended with an eulogy on Moray's character and abilities.[5]

[1] Ranke, *op. cit.*, V. 487.
[2] *M.C.*, II. 573–4.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 19.
[5] *M.C.*, II. 577–80.

During the absence of Sir Robert, the Independent section of the House of Commons had been greatly strengthened. By the end of October the Houses had learned from the captured correspondence of Lord Digby that Charles had made overtures to the Scottish army.[1] Moreover, by agreeing to the establishment of an Erastian type of Presbyterianism, the Independent leaders had conciliated many who were hostile to the toleration of sectaries. This improvement in the position of the Independent party was a subject of lament among the Scots in London. On the 24th of November the Commissioners pressed for supplies, for a settlement of the religious question, and that terms of peace should receive immediate consideration. To the last request the Commons agreed, but the propositions which they prepared were such as the King would certainly reject. Clearly, their zeal was purely fictitious. But if the Independents were not anxious for peace on the basis of Presbyterianism, they were willing to enter into negotiations with Charles on their own terms; and both Montereul and the Scots were aware of this by the middle of November.[2] The news was alarming, and Moray's return was eagerly awaited. Montereul, indeed, became impatient ;[3] he was not to leave for Oxford before Sir Robert's arrival, and yet the sooner he was there the better, if the King was to be prevented from coming to terms with the Independents.[4]

But the arrival of Moray was not to be immediately followed by the departure of Montereul. On hearing the report of the Scottish envoy, Balmerino, one of the Scottish Commissioners, was so irritated that it seemed as if the whole negotiation might terminate. It was not until the end of the year that he was willing to permit Montereul to proceed to Oxford.[5] To Sir Robert had fallen the task of pacifying

[1] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 5.
[2] *Ibid.*, III. 11–12.
[3] *M.C.*, I. 73–6.
[4] Some peculiar incident must have delayed Moray's return. *Cf. Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, f. 132, where Mazarin writes of "le malheur qui lui est survenu", "la disgrâce qui lui est arrivée", and expresses his joy that Sir Robert "en soit sorti à si bon marché."
[5] *M.C.*, I. 83–5.

the Commissioner, while Montereul had contented himself with seconding his endeavours.[1] But Holland, Lauderdale, and Moray were in agreement with Balmerino as to certain changes in the proposals which were to be submitted to the King.[2] They felt that it was now necessary to be more exacting. The House of Commons and the Scottish Parliament were in no mood for compromise,[3] and the eventual consent of the Estates would be essential to the success of the scheme. On receiving a passport from the House of Lords to proceed to Oxford, Montereul spent a day in consultation with Holland and Moray. He tried to obtain their adherence to the original terms, but it was he himself who ultimately yielded. He was to persuade the King to agree to the three Uxbridge Propositions, and he was to counsel him thereafter to join the Scottish army as quickly as possible. The King ought not to wait for a formal declaration in his favour by the Scottish Parliament.[4] Moray, however, assured Montereul that Balmerino was writing a letter to Loudoun, in which he would urge him " to dispose the Estates to accept what will be proposed to them by the King." [5]

On arriving at Oxford on the 2nd of January, Montereul found that he had left London with exaggerated hopes. The King was willing to join the Scottish army if the Scots would engage themselves for his safety. He would have nothing to do with the Uxbridge Propositions in so far as they related to religion. If he agreed to them, he would practically establish Presbytery in England. He did not believe that the Scots desired this for conscientious reasons. They wished the security of the bishops' lands for payment of their own arrears, and they feared that, if Episcopacy was permitted in England, it would ultimately be forced on Scotland. He suggested means of satisfying them on these two points, and he stated that Presbytery would be tolerated in England.

Montereul's last interview with the King took place on the

[1] *Ibid.*, I. 79.
[2] *Ibid.*, II. App., 577; I., 83–5, 89–91.
[3] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 25–6.
[4] *M.C.*, I. 102–10.
[5] *Ibid.*, I. 83–5.

5th of January, and with the royal answer he returned to Westminster. He did not anticipate that it would be welcomed, but the disfavour with which it was received exceeded his expectations.[1] The Scots in London were not the only people who were dissatisfied. The English Presbyterians were equally annoyed at his obstinacy, and they were on the point of coming to terms with the Independents. If this happened, the task of the Scots would become all the more difficult, and Montereul set himself to regain their support. His endeavours were attended with success, but he admitted that this result was due largely to the assistance of Holland and Moray, the Countess of Devonshire, and Lady Carlisle.[2]

Charles might still be persuaded, if Henrietta Maria were to write to him, and if William Murray, Sir Robert's cousin, were allowed to visit him. The Queen sent Murray to Charles "instructed with her mind about the negotiation,"[3] and she also addressed to Montereul an important letter which Murray was to take to the King.[4] He, however, was arrested at Canterbury on the 5th of February:[5] for the English Parliament had learned from a man called Wright, and from letters by the Queen and Jermyn, captured at Dartmouth on the 26th of January, that negotiations were proceeding between the Scottish Commissioners and the King.[6] The Commissioners had denied the truth of Wright's charges on the 24th of January, but their denial was in vain.[7]

Montereul wished to take to Oxford the letter which had reached him from Henrietta Maria. But the King knew

[1] *M.C.*, I. 102–10.
[2] *Ibid.*, I. 116–18.
[3] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 62–3.
[4] *Ibid.*, III. 70.
[5] *Ibid.*, III. 69.
[6] *Ibid.*, III. 62–3.
[7] *Ibid.*, III. 45.

Montereul and Moray seem not to have known the exact extent of the information which the English Parliament had acquired. They wished Wm. Murray to know that Henrietta Maria's letter for the King had reached Montereul safely; otherwise, he might reveal to the English Parliament information still unknown to it. Sir Robert succeeded in seeing his cousin, although the attempt was attended by considerable risk. By Feb. 19, he and Montereul learned that the English Parliament knew more than they had suspected. (See Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 70; *M.C.*, I. 139–43.)

from other sources that his wife was now anxious for an agreement with the Scots. He was still hostile to the terms which they wished him to grant. Early in March he tried to enter into relations with the Independent leaders, while at the same time he was planning for aid from the Catholics. Montereul, meantime, had not been able to leave London. The Houses of Parliament suspected the object of his visit to Oxford, and delayed his departure as long as possible.[1] He was not idle during his compulsory sojourn in London, but occupied his time in trying to reduce the demands of the Scottish Commissioners.

In the first place, he tried to obtain from them a written pledge of the conditions upon which they would make peace with the King, but this they refused to give him. If such a pledge were captured, those who had signed it would incur considerable risks, and the English Parliament would be able to reproach them with breach of faith. There had been too little secrecy already on the part of some who were under oath not to disclose information. Sir Robert Moray offered to affix his name to a written pledge on behalf of the Commissioners, and with this Montereul had to rest content.[2] Obviously this pledge would not inculpate anyone but the person who signed it. Montereul found an equal unwillingness to yield in regard to the question of the conditions to be put in writing. Charles must agree to the Uxbridge Propositions in respect of the Church, Ireland, and the Militia, and either before or after joining the army he must sign the Covenant. In that case, he would be received in the Scottish army with honour and respect. The Scots would intercede effectually with the English Parliament in favour of the King's followers, although five or six might have to absent themselves temporarily from the country. Should Charles agree to these terms, he must write two letters to signify this, one to the English Parliament and the Scottish Commissioners in London, and one to the Committee of Estates at Edinburgh (Feb. 26, 1646).[3]

[1] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 70–72. [2] *M.C.*, I. 150–4.
[3] *Bib. Nat. MSS.*, 16002, f. 28; Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III., 73.

Montereul felt that these terms were foredoomed to rejection, and as Loudoun arrived from Scotland "with large powers" [1] from the Parliament, he sought to induce the Scots to revert to the proposals which Moray had carried to Paris in October. In this task he was aided by Sir Robert Moray, "who acted in this negotiation with the greatest possible tact and prudence, and with a care that cannot be expressed." [2]

The Frenchman certainly obtained considerable modifications. By the second assurance, to which Moray's name was affixed on the 16th of March, it was stipulated that the King would be received in the Scottish army with honour and remain there in security. So also would the Princes Rupert and Maurice, the Secretary Nicholas, and Ashburnham. The Scots would intercede effectually for the other followers of the King, but three or four must live at a distance for some time. Charles, however, must first write to the English Parliament and the Scottish Commissioners in London as well as to the Committees of Estates in Scotland and at Newark. He must declare his agreement with the Uxbridge Proposition regarding the Militia, and promise that he would consent to the establishment of ecclesiastical affairs in the manner already agreed upon, or to be agreed upon, by the Parliaments and Assemblies of the two realms. Then the Scots would act so as to secure the King's reception by the English Parliament, and his restoration to his dignity and authority.[3] The important point of the assurance was that Charles was asked neither to sign the Covenant nor to approve of it.[4]

Before leaving for Oxford on the 17th of March, Montereul arranged that, when the King had decided to go to Newark,

[1] For the exact meaning of this phrase, see *Correspondence of the Scots Commissioners in London, 1644–1646*, ed. H. W. Meikle, Roxburghe Club, 1917. Introd. xxvi. *Cf.* Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 74.

[2] *M.C.*, I. 169–73.

[3] *Bib. Nat. MSS.*, 16002, f. 29; Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 75.

[4] Although this necessity was not expressed, it may have been understood. *Cf.* Bruce, *Letters of King Charles I. in 1646*, Camden Socy., 72. "Sir R. Moray told me five days ago that in the Scots' Treaty with you, the Covenant, although not mentioned, was meant: it was assumed that it would be understood as necessary." Charles I. to Henrietta Maria. Oct. 24, 1646.

he would acquaint the Scottish Commissioners with the fact. One of them would go to the Scottish army with this news. He was informed that the General and the Committee at Newark had been told of the design formed at London. A detachment of troops would advance to meet the King on receiving notice of his departure from Oxford.[1] He was also given to understand that all depended on the King. If Charles would but consent to the conditions of the second assurance, the City, the English Presbyterians, and the majority of the Lords would support the Scots.[2]

On arriving at Oxford on the 17th of March, Montereul found that the increasing weakness of his position had not made the King more pliable. He tried to persuade Charles that his wife desired him to sacrifice the peace of Ireland and that the temporary banishment of Montrose and some other friends did not amount to his forsaking them. To the King this seemed mere "juggling"[3]; and in his anger against the Scots he dispatched to the English Parliament a request for permission to return to Westminster (March 23, 1646). An Act of Oblivion would need to be passed and all sequestrations taken off the property of his supporters.[4] The sending of this letter "made Montereul open his pack"[5]; and, fearing an understanding between Charles and the Independents, he resolved to support the King in an attempt to reduce still further the Scottish terms. On the same day, therefore, Charles wrote to the Scots in London. If they would promise to him security both in conscience and honour, and if they would receive those who accompanied him, then he would go to Newark. The Scots must facilitate his journey from Oxford, and they must not object to a junction with the forces of Montrose. The Marquis himself would be sent as Ambassador to France. As to Church Government, the King would give full contentment on his arrival in London if he could be

[1] *M.C.*, I. 171–2.
[2] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 76.
[3] Bruce, *Letters of Charles I. in 1646*, 27.
[4] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 83.
[5] Bruce, *op. cit.*, 30.

persuaded that this would not be against his conscience.[1] Next day he added a few lines to his letter. If he heard from Montereul that his letter of the 23rd had taken effect, he would send an order to the Governor of Newark to deliver the town. This would enable the Scots to secure the King's passage from Oxford.[2] On the 27th of March Montereul, by the royal command, sent to the Scottish Commissioners in London a request for a speedy answer.[3]

These communications were not received by Moray until the 2nd of April,[4] but Montereul did not wait for a reply from London.[5] He feared the dangers of delay, and relying upon the passionate devotion of the Scots to their King, he promised to Charles in the name of Louis and the Queen Regent that he would be received at Newark "in all freedom of his conscience and honour."

"All such of his subjects and servants as shall be there with him shall be safely and honourably protected in their persons; the Scots shall really and effectually join with the King of Great Britain, and also receive all such persons as shall come in unto him, and join with them for His Majesty's preservation; and they shall employ all their armies and forces to assist His Majesty in the procuring of a happy and well-grounded peace."[6]

On the same day (April 1, 1646), Charles promised on his part that only his two nephews and Ashburnham would accompany him to Newark. All his servants were to be saved from ruin. On arriving in the Scottish army he would willingly receive instruction in the Presbyterian Government, and, in general, he would satisfy the Scots so far as he conscientiously could.[7]

The French Agent had thus made an engagement for which, by his own confession, he had no authority from the Scottish

[1] *Egerton MSS., Brit. Mus. Add. MSS.*, 2545, f. 41.
[2] *Ibid.*, March 24, 1646.
[3] *Ibid.*, March 27, 1646.
[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 219. See *post*, Appendix C.
[5] *Egerton MSS., Brit. Mus. Add. MSS.*, 2545, ff. 73, 74. A draft of Montereul's engagement.
[6] *Ibid.*, f. 43.
[7] *Ibid.*, f. 42.

Commissioners. They, however, on receipt of the letter sent by Montereul on the 27th of March, permitted Sir Robert Moray to affix his name on the 2nd of April to a third assurance.

"Messieurs les Députés d'Écosse m'ont autorisé, comme auparavant, pour assurer Sa Majesté très Chrétienne et Votre Excellence, que le Roi de la Grande Bretagne étant en l'armée écossaise, ils ne désireront rien de lui que ce qui est pour le bien et la conservation de sa personne, son autorité, et son honneur, et de sa posterité, sans forcer sa conscience, ne doutant point que Sa Majesté ne fasse franchement et de bon gré tout ce qui est requis pour l'établissement de la religion, ce qui est le seul moyen pour procurer une paix honorable, la conservation de sa personne et l'union de ses royaumes."[1]

This document does not reveal what would be the future relations between the King's followers and the Royalist forces on the one hand and the Scots on the other. It is impossible to say what Charles was intended to conclude from the omission of all reference to this important matter. Such as it was, the assurance would be sent to Oxford, and it is probable that it arrived there before Montereul's departure for Newark. He was to have left on the 2nd of April, but he did not go until the 3rd.[2] He may have waited for the reply from London. Moray certainly expected that it would be received in time, for in a letter to Mazarin of the 9th he said that Montereul would take to Newark an order for the surrender of the town.[3] The French Agent did take with him such an order.[4] This may have been due, however, to the fact that on the 1st of April he had personally promised to Charles the support of the Scots on his own terms. Before his departure he made another unwarranted concession to the King. Charles could tell his council about his negotiation

[1] *Bib. Nat. MSS.*, 16002, ff. 29–30. Copies of three assurances, to which Moray's name is attached by order of the Scottish Commissioners, are placed together in this volume.

[2] *Letters of Charles I. in 1646*, 31.

[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 219. See *post* App. C.

[4] *M.C.*, I. 181.

with the Scots, so that, if he miscarried by the way, the Independents would be acquainted with the facts, and an irreconcilable hatred established between them and their Scottish allies.[1] Moray and the Commissioners had been very anxious that Charles should not disclose his intentions to his council.[2]

If Montereul had already quitted Oxford before the third assurance reached the city, he would learn about its contents from Balmerino, who was dispatched to Newark about the 3rd of April.[3] The Frenchman was the first to reach his destination, and his reception by the Scottish leaders was not such as he had anticipated. According to his own account, they had not received the slightest intimation of what had been decided upon. Balmerino's delay was due to his zeal as a sabbatarian, and Montereul visited him at a place 13 miles distant. The emissary from London said that the Army Commissioners would act according to the instructions which he was bringing. "Yet" wrote Montereul, "all was refused me of which I had the most formal assurance from Sir Robert Moray." They would neither send a detachment of troops to meet the King, nor would they supply the French Agent with the means of preventing Charles from leaving Oxford.[4]

The news of these events was not long in reaching the Commissioners in London, and the Scottish Chancellor proceeded to Royston where a Conference was held with Dun-

[1] *Letters of Charles I. in 1646*, 32.
[2] *M.C.*, I. 169–73.
[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 219. See *post*, App. C.
[4] *M. C.*, I. 180, 185–6.

Montereul evidently believed that the Scottish Commissioners had lied to him in March when they said that the Army Commissioners had been informed of the plan. (See p. 41.) He was probably quite mistaken. The army leaders knew early in the year that negotiations were on foot. (*Letters of Charles I. in 1646*, 13.) They might have been willing to fulfil the terms of the second assurance. There had not been time to acquaint them from London of the existence of a third assurance; that was to have been Balmerino's duty. On the 23rd of April, Moray admitted to Mazarin that they had not been "well informed of the state of affairs by those here" until after the arrival of Montereul at Newark. The fact that they showed hostility to the French Agent does not imply that he arrived in Newark without having heard of Moray's latest reply. Even Balmerino could not induce them to do what the Frenchman desired, and he knew of the third assurance.

fermline and Balcarres.[1] In a letter to Nicholas of the 16th of April, Montereul explained to what extent it had been fruitful in good results. The Scots refused to permit any of the Royalist forces to join their army; the two Princes and Ashburnham could come with the King, but if the English Parliament demanded them, they must effect their escape from Britain. Montrose was to go as ambassador neither to France nor to any other country. They could not come to a rupture with the English Parliament about the King's following, but they would employ means to obtain good terms for them. Finally, if Charles came to Newark, he was to grant Presbyterianism as soon as possible. Montereul was not satisfied, and he advised the King to join the Scots only as a last resort.[2]

Charles got word of the Royston conference from London as well as from Newark.[3] Moreover, on the 16th of April, a letter was written (probably by Moray) which seems to have been intended for the King through Montereul.[4] The Commissioners in London authorised the writer to state that the King's conscience would not be forced. This was also included in a letter which Sir Robert wrote to Mazarin on the 23rd of April.

"Après que Messieurs les Députés d'Écosse qui résident à l'armée ont été bien informés de l'état des affaires par ceux d'ici, ils ont accordé à M. de Montereul tout ce qui a été promis . . . c'est à dire que le Roi de la Grande Bretagne serait reçu en l'armée avec toute sorte d'honneur et demeurerait en sûreté, et qu'on ne forcerait point sa conscience, et qui plus est ne l'ont obligé à quoi que ce soit, seulement d'avoir promis à M. de Montereul d'écrire ici une lettre devant que de partir de Oxford, qui mettrait les Indépendants dans leur tort, et unirait ceux de son parti pour être plus capable de le servir."[5]

It is rather difficult to reconcile this account of what

[1] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, ff. 231, 233. See *post*, App. C. *M.C.*, I. 180.
[2] *M.C.*, I. 181.
[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 233. See *post*, App. C.
[4] *Egerton MSS., Brit. Mus. Add. MSS.*, 2545. April 16, 1646.
[5] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 231. See *post*, App. C.

happened at Royston with that which Montereul sent to Nicholas. It is certain that the French Agent counted as a breach of promise the refusal of the Scots to accept proposals which he had made to the King on his own responsibility. No one but he had ever definitely said that the Scots would join with the Royalist forces; no one but he had ever explicitly agreed that Montrose should go as ambassador to France. On the other hand, Moray was not justified in telling Mazarin that the promise of the 2nd of April was to be observed. The Scots had made their wishes about religion so much more definite that from the point of view of the King these wishes could be said to have varied.

Charles, at any rate, was furious on receiving the Frenchman's account. The Scots, he said, were "abominable relapsed rogues."[1] This was on the 21st of April, and next day he tried to induce Ireton to make an agreement. Ireton refused, and Colonel Rainsborough, who was attacking Woodstock, did not reply to a similar request made to him three days later.[2]

The last resort had become necessary. By the 20th of April Montereul had probably received the unsigned letter sent to him from London on the 16th ;[3] for on that day he informed the King by letter that "the disposition of the Scottish commanders was all that could be desired." They were beginning to send troops to Burton. The Governor of Newark was of opinion that Charles ought to join the Scots, for if he was caught in Oxford he would be lost. Fairfax, indeed, was rapidly approaching, and Charles, after telling his council that he was going to London, left Oxford with Ashburnham and Hudson on the 27th.[4]

Probably he had not yet decided what he was going to do. On the 1st of May he was "in a place whence he can go to France, Scotland, or Denmark."[5] Already, on the 28th of April, Hudson had been dispatched to Southwell where

[1] *Letters of Charles I. in 1646*, 36.
[2] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 95–6.
[3] See *ante*, p. 45.
[4] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 97.
[5] *M.C.*, I. 188.

Montereul was quartered. The French Agent was to try to get from the Scots a written assurance of favourable conditions. This proved impossible. They gave, however, a verbal assent to a written form drawn up by Montereul. They would secure the King in his person and honour, and they would not press him to do anything contrary to his conscience. Ashburnham and Hudson would be protected. If the English Parliament refused, upon a message from Charles, to restore him to his rights, the Scots would declare for him, and take all his friends into their protection. If the Parliament did agree to restore the King, then only four of his friends would suffer banishment. Having received from Hudson this last assurance, Charles resolved to make for Newark, and he reached Southwell on the morning of the 5th of May.[1]

Thus neither Moray nor the Commissioners in London had any direct share in the last stage of the negotiations. But there is no doubt that they approved of the verbal agreement which the Army Commissioners gave to Montereul's four promises. Neither Charles, nor Montereul, nor Moray and the Scottish Commissioners were quite honest in their proceedings. Charles wished the Scots to suppose that he might be argued into a belief in Presbyterianism, and he never refused to write the letters mentioned in the second assurance. He did not believe that they had conscientious objections to Episcopacy, and he hoped to win them to his side on his own terms. Montereul promised that, if the Scots broke faith, the French Government would force them to adhere to their engagements; but he knew quite well that the European situation would make this impossible. The Scots, on their part, did not wish the Independents to get possession of the King; and there is no doubt that they allured him to their camp with words which meant one thing to them and something very different to him. In Moray's third assurance, Charles was told that his conscience would not be forced, but that he was expected to do "what was required" for the establishment of religion. Charles certainly did not think

[1] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 99–102.

that Presbyterianism was required; the Scots, on the other hand, doubtless intended to interpret the phrase in relation to the terms of the second assurance. At Royston a more definite note was sounded. But after that conference was over, Moray still wrote to Mazarin about freedom of conscience, as if it was compatible with the writing of a letter, "*qui mettrait les Indépendants dans leur tort.*" The four promises delivered by Hudson to the King contain the same combination of contradictories. If this position was a true one, why should Charles, after receipt of the second assurance, have asked for a stipulation that his conscience would not be forced?[1] The King's request was made precisely because he could not conscientiously write the letter demanded of him in the second assurance. On the other hand, just as Charles did not believe that the Scots would always demand the abolition of Episcopacy in England, so the Scots did not suppose that Charles would permanently insist upon Episcopacy. He had expressed to them a willingness to be instructed, and the Scottish Commissioners, no doubt, thought that reason was on their side, and that reason would ultimately prevail. It is hardly credible that they would have enticed the King to Newark unless they had cherished this hope. They were well aware that the Scottish Parliament would certainly not support the cause of the King on any other condition.

When Charles arrived at Newark the Scots treated him in a manner which greatly incensed Montereul.[2] Lothian had told the King that he must sign the Covenant, order the establishment of Presbyterianism in England and Ireland, and direct Montrose to lay down his arms.[3] Charles refused and ordered Montereul to summon Loudoun and Moray from

[1] Moray seems to have thought that the process of persuading the King would be a rather tedious one. This seems to be the inference from a letter to Mazarin by Du Bosc of the 3rd of May. He stated that he had received a letter from Sir Robert (presumably that of April 15) and that Montereul would probably not be able to leave the Scottish army for a long time (*Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 246). Du Bosc may have come to this conclusion after a perusal of Moray's letter. (*Ibid.*, f. 233.)

[2] *M.C.*, I. 192–5.

[3] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 103.

London.[1] He hoped that after their arrival he would be less importuned; but Montereul probably did not share his opinion, for by this time he had lost faith in Sir Robert and the Scottish Commissioners.[2]

Before the 7th of May, however, he had done what the King desired ;[3] but as Moray had sprained his ankle it was not until the 14th of May that he began his journey.[4] Before this date the Scottish Commissioners in the Army had written to the English Parliament expressing their surprise at the King's arrival,[5] handed over Newark to the English Commissioners, and ordered a march to Newcastle. This town was reached on the 13th of May.[6] Moray had joined the army before the 20th, but he had not been able to change the behaviour of his countrymen. He requested Montereul, however, not to report their actions to Mazarin, and led him to hope that all would be put right, and that the Scots would yet come and " ask excuses for all."[7] In reality, Moray did not take such a serious view of the actions of the Scots as Montereul suggested in his letter to Mazarin. " Some of the Scots " he wrote to Du Bosc, " have been a little uncivil, and the harm was increased by the manner in which he " [Montereul] " resented their conduct " (May 28).[8] Sir Robert added that if the King would yield to their wishes, the Scots would reinstate him on his throne either by joint consent or by force.

Even before Montereul's letters reached Mazarin, the Cardinal had heard unpleasant rumours about the attitude

[1] *M.C.*, I. 194.

[2] *Ibid.*, I. 192.

[3] *Ibid.*, II. App. 581.

[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 268.

[5] *Lords' Journal*, VIII. 305–6. *Cf.* S. R. Gardiner, *Hamilton Papers*, Camden Society, 1880, 141–2. Moray to Hamilton, Dec. 29, 1646. " He " [Charles] " debated with me the strange boldness of a declaration that hath been made among you, that the army knew nothing of his coming. I only argued a difference between knowing a thing and hearing tell of it, when it was not believed." This argument obviously was not based upon the facts of the case.

[6] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 104.

[7] *M.C.*, I. 200–1.

[8] *Ibid.*, II. 582.

of the Scots to Charles.[1] He hoped that they would prove false, but the letters from his Agent confirmed them. Nor did Moray's explanation of what had happened satisfy him. He was astonished that Sir Robert did not cry out against the proceedings of his countrymen,[2] and he expressed to him frankly his surprise and annoyance. Moray, however, had suggested that Charles need only agree to the wishes of the Scots in order to gain their support. Therefore, the Cardinal himself, Henrietta Maria, and, above all, Bellièvre, who had returned to England as Ambassador after an absence of six years, would do what they could to induce the King to yield. But Moray, who was "plus engagé que nul autre en cette occasion," was requested to do his part among the Scottish leaders. "Vous solliciterez vivement ceux qui ont la direction des affaires de prendre un parti qui sera toujours le plus honnête et le plus utile pour eux" (June 21, 1646).[3] The Cardinal evidently hoped that the Scots would revert to the terms of the third assurance.

Moray can hardly fail to have been amused at Mazarin's adoption of this lofty ethical strain. Personally, he would willingly have spared the King the necessity of signing or imposing the Covenant.[4] But the bulk of Scottish opinion was against him, and he was too shrewd not to know it. Moreover, he was not to play a very prominent or influential part either during the King's stay at Newcastle or during the eighteen months which succeeded the departure of Charles for Holmby.[5]

[1] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, f. 153.
[2] *Ibid.*, 52, f. 322.
[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 340.
[4] Gardiner, *Hamilton Papers*, 123–26. Nov. 14, 1646, to Hamilton:— "If by any means possible and consistent with religion and the public good, waive the imposing of the Covenant by a law." "Whether it be to be expected that Scotland shall ever reap any benefit from their brethren's observing of it" [the Covenant]. p. 133. Moray to Hamilton. Dec. 2, 1646.
[5] It is true that Burnet uses words which give another impression. Moray "at that time was known to His Majesty; and he, discovering in him those great parts and excellent qualities that recommended him to the love and esteem of all virtuous persons that knew him, honoured him with a great deal of freedom; and it was believed few were more in his favour than he was." (*Lives of the Hamiltons*, 1852 edn., 356.) This is not borne out by the *Letters of Charles I.* The King scarcely mentions Sir Robert, and he includes the Scots

Nevertheless, the somewhat meagre record of his actions during that period seems to warrant the conclusion that he regretted the policy of union with the English Parliament which the Scots tended more and more to follow from July, 1646, to January, 1647. He did what he could to prevent its consummation, and, after the Scots had recrossed the Tweed, he was ready to side with whatever party inclined to war with England. In other words, he was labouring first to prevent and then to undo the consequences of his action in enticing Charles to Newark. If he did not adopt this course until the month of July, this does not mean that he was impelled to it by Mazarin's reproaches. It was only in July that an agreement between the King and the Scots on the Scottish terms began definitely to appear improbable.[1]

Sir Robert cannot have received the Cardinal's letter until the end of June. By that time much had happened since the King's arrival at Newcastle. Charles had been playing equally with the English Parliament and the Scots. On the 18th of May he wrote to the two Houses and to the Committee of Estates in terms which seemed to indicate an intention of compliance. In reality, he both hoped and planned for aid from France and Rome. His request for enlightenment from Henderson was granted. Charles only sought to gain time, although he doubtless enjoyed his theological combats with

around him in a general condemnation. "All who come about me are knaves or fools; all have a tincture at least of falsehood." (p. 44.) In a sense, of course, both sources of information may be reconciled. Moray may have been one of the least suspected. His own letters to Hamilton (Gardiner's *Hamilton Papers*, 106–147 *passim*) prove beyond doubt that he was much about the King's person, and that he was well acquainted with what was going on. Indeed, they afford a very interesting picture of Charles' demeanour during the months at Newcastle. What chiefly struck Moray was the King's tranquil insouciance amid events of evil import for his interests. At the most, these sources only prove that Sir Robert may have had some influence over the King: they do not affect the question of his influence among his countrymen.

[1] This view of his activities is quite compatible with the fact that Moray, during the latter half of 1646, did his best to induce Charles to yield to the Scottish demands. Nor is it rendered untenable by the fact that in October he wrote to Mazarin defending the Scots. He would not desire the Cardinal to know that he was no longer at one with them. The general drift of his policy seems to bear out the conclusion adopted in the text. (For his letter to Mazarin, see *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 630.)

the most prominent Scottish minister of the time.[1] The weeks of June passed thus in purely academic discussion, but the English Parliament was now both impatient and distrustful. On the 8th of June, the King's intercepted letter to Ormonde was read in Parliament, and it became certain that the Scots had negotiated with the King before he came to Newark. The Commissioners in London denied this; but Hudson's confession of the 18th of June increased the anger against the Scots. Argyle saw clearly that the English Parliament must be conciliated, and that if Presbyterianism was to be established in England, it was from the English Parliament and not from Charles that this concession must be obtained. On the 25th of June he addressed the Committees of the two Houses, and concluded by accepting the peace propositions which they had spent so many months in preparing.[2]

More than a month elapsed before the English Commissioners reached Newcastle and besought the King's assent to their terms. Bellièvre, Argyle and Hamilton, the last of whom had been set at liberty by Fairfax, all begged him to accept Presbyterianism. On other than ecclesiastical matters the Scottish Commissioners at Newcastle were willing to moderate their demands. They would be content with what Moray had proposed in Paris. The King refused the Scottish terms, and to the English Commissioners he handed on the 1st of August a letter requesting more time to decide and permission to come to London to discuss matters.[3]

Sir Robert thought that the Scots had not yielded sufficiently. He made this clear in a letter which he wrote to Lauderdale at the command of Charles, and which Burnet inserted in the *Lives of the Hamiltons*. He had talked with

[1] G. Burnet, *Lives of the Hamiltons*, 356–7. Moray's part in this affair is thus related: "Him therefore did His Majesty employ in that exchange of papers, being all written with his own hand, and in much less time than Mr. Henderson did his. They were given by His Majesty to Sir Robert Moray to transcribe, the copies under Sir R. Moray's hand were by him delivered to Mr. Henderson, and Mr. Henderson's hand not being so legible as his, he, by the King's appointment, transcribed them for His Majesty."

[2] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 117.

[3] *Ibid.*, III. 133–4.

the King about the propositions, to see how far he could be induced to yield to them. The King, he found, was willing to treat on the following grounds. Until he received further enlightenment he could consent to the establishment of Presbyterianism for three years with toleration for Anglicans. He would grant the Parliament power over the militia for ten years. There ought to be a general pardon of delinquents. Holders of office could be appointed by the Houses " for this time " ; future vacancies would be filled in the former manner. Finally, the King could not abandon Ireland. Moray concluded that on these terms peace would almost certainly be obtained, and " if it should fail on our part for our not hearing of our Sovereign, it would be an unparalleled misfortune, not without infamy." [1] These words are interesting because they are the first illustration of his new political tendency, of his desire that the Scots should yield somewhat to the King.

Hamilton, in his opinion, was the Scottish statesman from whom the King could most reasonably hope for moderate terms. The Duke, by his influence, might also induce his countrymen to be less uncompromising. During the month of August Hamilton did attempt to persuade the Scots to make concessions.[2] They were so far from thinking of this that they sent him as one of their Commissioners to Newcastle to urge the King to give way (Sept. 4).[3] Much against his will the Duke proceeded to Newcastle ; but, as he failed to persuade the King, he spoke of retiring from public life. Moray did not approve of this intention, but Charles permitted Hamilton to do as he chose. According to Sir Robert, the King was very grieved, and felt that the Duke's enemies would attribute his resolution to unworthy motives. Moray convinced him that Hamilton's decision was not unchangeable, and, at his instigation, the King wrote a letter which persuaded the Duke to reconsider it.[4] Sir Robert may have

[1] G. Burnet, *Lives of the Hamiltons*, 364.
[2] *Ibid.*, 366.
[3] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 140.
[4] Gardiner, *Hamilton Papers*, 117–8 ; Burnet, *Lives of the Hamiltons*, 372–3.

imagined that he had thus done the King a considerable service. But probably Hamilton did not really intend to retire from public life. Besides, it is quite certain that Charles had a much lower estimate of his loyalty and usefulness than Moray, and it is beyond doubt that his judgment in this particular was the truer one.[1]

Even if Hamilton was more loyal than Charles supposed, he was unable to prevent the Scottish Parliament from coming to an agreement with the English Parliament which was fatal to the King's hopes. Charles, in fact, had exhausted the patience of every party in Great Britain. He had made offers which no one would accept, and offers had been made to him which he had rejected. On the 16th of December the arrangements for the departure of the Scots were concluded. A week later (Dec. 24), the Commons voted that the King should be brought to Holmby House. The Scottish Parliament had drawn up conditions of agreement which the King would certainly refuse. Of these terms the Scottish army leaders heard on the 22nd of December. They considered them harsh, and implored Charles to agree to the establishment of Presbyterianism in England. If he would do this, they would fight for him against both Parliaments. But the King refused even this offer.[2]

Charles had still two expedients in mind, neither of which he carried out. There was the plan of escaping to the Continent.

" The design " says Burnet, " was thus laid : Mr. Murray had provided a vessel at Tinmouth, and Sir Robert Moray was to have conveyed the King thither in a disguise ; and it proceeded so far that the King put himself in the disguise and went down the back stairs with Sir R. Moray. But his Majesty, apprehending it was scarce possible to pass through all the guards without being discovered, and judging it hugely indecent to be caught in such a condition, changed his

[1] Gardiner, *Hamilton Papers*, 117–9 ; *cf. Letters of Charles I. in 1646*, 65, 85.
[2] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 186.

resolution and went back; as Sir R. Moray informed the writer." (Dec. 24.)[1]

The Scots at Newcastle heard of this affair and kept a close watch on the King's movements. The news also reached London, and W. Murray was summoned by the House of Commons on the 11th of January, 1647.[2] On the same date, the Lords issued an order to the Governor of Newcastle to "keep Sir R. Moray and W. Murray in safe custody," and then hand them over to the Gentleman Usher of the Lords.[3] But neither of the two cousins was molested by the Scots, from which Montereul seems to have concluded that the plan had never been serious.[4] But this was not a necessary inference. There must have been many at Newcastle who approved of the attempt. It would have been foolish to irritate them by punishing Sir Robert and his cousin; to take no measures would not lead to a rupture with the English Parliament.

It was to bring about such a rupture that Charles now inclined. He thought of disclosing the conditions upon which he had joined the Scottish army.[5] But the idea was not carried out because, if Montereul is to be believed, Sir Robert Moray "had offered to repair what is past by some signal service, and had promised to deliver him from Holmby House if he had the honour of going with him there." Charles was certainly told by the Scottish Commissioners, and by Moray and his cousin, that he would gain nothing by his proposed action. He would only "get into trouble two or three people who had tried to serve him."[6] Thus nothing was disclosed, and no rupture took place. On the contrary, the Scots quitted the King on the 30th of January, and a fortnight later they had all crossed the Border. "The news

[1] Burnet, *Lives of the Hamiltons*, 391. Burnet says that he does not know where the King intended to go on escaping. This seems curious. Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 186.
[2] *Commons' Journals*, V. 49.
[3] *Lords' Journals*, VIII. 664.
[4] *M.C.*, I. 401–7, 412.
[5] Gardiner, *Hamilton Papers*, 141–2, Dec. 29, 1646.
[6] *M.C.*, I. 401–7, 415–6, 423–6.

that one can communicate to you is so sad" wrote Moray to Du Bosc on the 29th, "that I have not courage enough to relate it to you in detail. In one word, before Saturday next, the King of Great Britain will be in the hands of the English. Permit me then to add nothing further." [1] These words in themselves do not imply disapproval of the transaction which the Scots were about to conclude; they may express merely regret at the inevitable. But taken in conjunction with his actions during the previous six months and the subsequent eighteen, it is possible that they contain a certain amount of censure.[2] It is difficult to justify such disapproval. The Scots, as a nation, had never promised to fight for Charles on his own terms. If they took him with them to Scotland, they would only encourage a movement among the Scottish Royalists. To let him escape to the Continent would be to run the risk of foreign invasion. If there was no danger of foreign invasion, there would be the active hostility of England. But Moray's position was different from that of his countrymen. Like the Scottish Commissioners he had allured Charles to Newark with equivocal words. He had done so in the hope that the King would yield to their demands, but his hopes had proved false. In such circumstances it would have been dishonourable not to regret the unexpected but disastrous result of his actions. Regret of this kind might insensibly pass into annoyance at the policy of his countrymen, however justifiable it might be.

Whether he disapproved of or merely regretted the action of the Scots, Moray henceforth sided with the Argyles or with the Hamiltons according to their attitude to the question of armed intervention in England. After the arrival of Charles at Holmby, the quarrel between the English Presbyterians and the Independents became acute. By the month of May, even before the King's abduction, the former in agreement with

[1] *Ibid.*, II. App. 588.

[2] Montereul, it is true, speaks of Moray as if at this moment he were on the side of the Scottish Parliament (*M.C.*, I. 423–6); but his insinuations about Sir Robert are so frequent and gratuitous that he cannot be relied on.

the Scots dispatched Dunfermline to France. There he was to persuade Henrietta Maria to send the Prince of Wales to Scotland.[1]

During the months of June and July, it was the Argyle and clerical party which was anxious for war with the Independents.[2] Moray approved of the scheme to bring the Prince to Scotland. His presence would help to unite all parties in a common service of the King. Hamilton was hostile to the idea of intervention, because the Argyle party would dominate in the invading army. Sir Robert spoke to him on the subject of the Prince's coming, and the Duke professed his readiness to serve him on his arrival ; but he refused to co-operate with Argyle.[3]

Early in August Argyle began to waver in his attitude to intervention. This was a sufficient reason for the Hamiltons to change theirs. The Committee of Estates empowered them to send Lanark and Loudoun as commissioners to the King.[4] Military movements would be postponed for a year ; by that time they hoped to command a majority in Parliament. Moray now joined the Hamilton party, doubtless with more readiness than he had joined the Argyle faction, for the Hamiltons were willing to be lenient to the King in regard to religion.[5] They adhered to the plan of inviting the Prince to Scotland. Traquair left for London before the 26th of October ; he was commissioned to persuade the King to agree to the proposal. Montereul believed that Sir Robert was to leave soon for France in connection with the same matter,[6] but it was not until the following summer that he sailed from Scotland.[7]

During the winter of 1647–48 his relations with Argyle were such that Montereul believed him to be one of his

[1] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 278.
[2] *Ibid.*, III. 300.
[3] *M.C.*, II. 188–190, 193–5.
[4] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, III. 359–60.
[5] *M.C.*, II. 240.
[6] *Ibid.*, II. 294–5, 298–300.
[7] *Ibid.*, II. 466.

followers.[1] But when carefully examined they do not support that conclusion. Before the 30th of November Argyle proposed to Montereul that he should become Colonel of the Scottish Guards in place of Moray, who was willing to act as Lieut.-Colonel.[2] The regiment would be increased from 2,000 to 4,500. During the next three months Sir Robert often spoke to the French Agent about this scheme.[3] It is natural to demand why one who was to become an Engager should have approved of Argyle's plan. In the summer of 1647 the Marquis had been hostile to the transport of troops to France, because he was anxious for war with England. The Hamilton party now held this point of view, and Moray shared it with them. On the other hand, Argyle would be able to raise some thousands from among his own vassals, and Sir Robert may have felt that, for the success of the Engagement, they would be better out of the way. By the beginning of May, 1648, the Engagement policy had triumphed. But a large section of the clergy was hostile to it, and Argyle, probably hoping to organise resistance, said nothing more about his former proposal. On the 3rd of May, therefore, Sir Robert left for France, where his duties as Colonel would claim part of his attention. But his departure was also connected with the plan for the coming of the Prince to Scotland.

Henrietta Maria and Jermyn were, in fact, anxious for a coalition with the Presbyterians, and, in the absence of Hyde, the Prince was very dependent on their advice. Before the end of June he had been formally invited to join Hamilton's army, but he had not agreed to do so. The terms which Sir William Fleming had conveyed to him were not acceptable. Instead of going to Scotland he left Paris on the 25th of June in order to join at Helvoetsluys that portion of the English fleet which had declared for the King.[4] In July, the

[1] *Ibid.*, II. 337–9, 321.

[2] Moray was appointed Colonel of the Scottish Guards in 1645. Between that date and 1650 he was busy recruiting troops for France. See *post*, Chapter IV.

[3] *M.C.*, II. 337–9, 407–10.

[4] Eva Scott, *The King in Exile*, London, 1905, 48–50.

Committee of Estates commissioned Lauderdale to visit the Prince and to induce him to come to Scotland by offering more favourable terms. In addition, Lauderdale was to visit both France and Holland, and to obtain, if possible, money, arms, and ammunition from the authorities in these countries. If he was not able to carry out in person the second part of his instructions, he was to appoint the fittest Scottish gentleman as his substitute.[1]

Lauderdale reached the Downs on the 10th of August; six days later he had persuaded the Prince to join the Duke's army. He then acquainted him with his mission to Holland and France.

"He was very well pleased with it, and thought it might be of very good use, but he would upon no terms consent that I should leave him. He thought it might be of good use in Holland, and was very well pleased that Sir Robert Moray was to go into France in case I went not: but because there is so much to do in settling this fleet, those hours that the Prince stays here, he commanded Sir Robert Moray to go alone to Holland, from whence he is to be dispatched" (August 19.[2])

A few days later Lauderdale heard of the disaster at Preston, and the news would render Sir Robert Moray's task useless.

In espousing the cause of the Engagers, Sir Robert Moray had taken part in an effort foredoomed to failure. Between a King like Charles and a people with the theological notions of the Scots, no agreement could be made. Thus when Moray, among others, induced Charles to come to Newark with words of doubtful meaning, he had committed an action which was bound to lead to the surrender of the King by the Scots. He had taken a step which, from the strictly ethical standpoint, could not be justified. On the other hand, he was not "the cunning man" whom Clarendon distrusted,[3] nor the unprincipled intriguer at whom Montereul was pleased to sneer. He had really hoped for a reconciliation of Charles and the

[1] Gardiner, *Hamilton Papers*, 236.
[2] Gardiner, *Hamilton Papers*, 245–6.
[3] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, ed. W. D. Macray, 1888, IV. Bk. ix. 175.

Scots, and he did not cynically repudiate responsibility for the results of his action. His connection with the affairs of Charles was unfortunate, but it was at least loyal. It ended in the summer of 1648, but at the same time his relations with the future Charles the Second began. During the young King's exile, Moray was to help his perishing cause in Scotland; after the Restoration he was an honoured friend. It is impossible to doubt his faithfulness to the son, and therefore it is difficult to discredit his loyalty to the father.

The notices of Sir Robert's political activities from August, 1648, to September, 1651, are so scanty that it is impossible to make a connected narrative of them. He had returned to Scotland by March, 1649.[1] As an Engager, his position would not have been pleasant, had he not been friendly with Argyle.[2] To be on good terms with the Marquis was certainly the sole means by which Moray could obtain recruits for his regiment, but the cause of Charles II. could not dispense with the support of Argyle and his party. Hence Sir Robert's intimacy with him was perhaps only one more proof of his indifference to factions, except in so far as they were inclined to further the royal cause. It is probable that Lanark and Lauderdale had also come to terms with the Marquis, and the former at least had disavowed the Engagement.[3] Moray had certainly not done this by the 18th of May, 1650. On that date "the Commission of the General Assembly appointed the Presbytery of St. Andrews to take special trial of the carriage of Sir Robert Moray in relation to the public cause, especially his accession to the late unlawful Engagement, and, if they find any guiltiness, to censure him accordingly and to make report of their diligence the next meeting of the Commission."[4] What he said to the Presbytery of St. Andrews does not appear. After the battle

[1] *Harleian MSS.* (Brit. Mus.), 4551, March 27, 1649.
[2] *Ibid.*, March 26/April 5, 1650.
[3] Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*, I. 18–19.
[4] *Proceedings of the Commissioners of the General Assembly*, Scot. Hist. Socy., II. 397.

of Dunbar the Scottish Parliament began to show an inclination to admit Engagers and even Royalists to civil and military offices, on condition of formal repentance. This tendency became more manifest in the early months of 1651,[1] and Moray must have shared in the general hypocrisy of declaring repentance. Otherwise, he would not have been appointed Justice-Clerk (March 21, 1651), a Privy Councillor (March 29), and a Lord of Session (June 6).[2] He was at the time in financial difficulties,[3] but his tenure of these offices was to be very brief.[4] Hence he cannot have gained greatly by his acceptance of them, which would change once more the character of his political relations to Argyle.

The only other allusion to Moray as a politician during this period occurs in John Livingstone's Account of the Treaty with the King at Breda.[5] "Lothian" he says, "was many ways involved with the Marquis of Argyle, who for a long time had been very entire with W. Murray and Sir Robert Moray, negotiators for the King, and who, it is thought, put him in hopes that the King might marry his daughter." There are many indications in the State Papers of the time that W. Murray was a negotiator for the King, but there are none to give this impression about his cousin. Livingstone is extremely vague about the proposed marriage between Charles II. and Anne Campbell. Little indeed is known about it. It is uncertain when the proposal was first seriously made, and whose idea it originally was.[6] That Sir Robert Moray may have had something to do with it is all that can be said.

[1] Gardiner, *op. cit.*, I. 383–7.
[2] *A.P.S.*, VI. (ii), 648b, 653b, 656b, 686b.
[3] *Cf. post*, Ch. IV, p. 73, and also *post*, Ch. VI. p. 99.
[4] Brunton and Haig, *Senators of the College of Justice*, *s.v.* Sir R. Moray.
[5] *Select Biographies*, Wodrow Socy., 170.
[6] See Hillier, *King Charles in the Isle of Wight*, 325–31; Clarendon, *op. cit.*, V. Bk. xiii. 50; Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 101, *n.* 1; Gardiner, *Hist. of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*, I. 387–93; Eva Scott, *The King in Exile*, Lond. 1905, 139, 168, 197; J. Willcock, *The Great Marquess*, Edin. 1903, 263–9.

CHAPTER IV

1645–1650

COLONEL OF THE SCOTTISH GUARDS—THE RECRUITING OF SOLDIERS FOR FRANCE

When Mazarin sent Montereul to London in the autumn of 1645, it was not only that he might effect an understanding between the Scots and their King. He was also commissioned to obtain from Scotland as many recruits as possible for the French service.[1] In 1644 negotiations had been entered into at Munster which were ultimately to result in the Peace of Westphalia (1648). But so successful an issue was not at all certain in 1645. The war might continue yet for many years, and in that case soldiers from abroad would be as necessary as ever. The enemy would be all the more ready to conclude a treaty when it was seen that France could obtain foreign troops.[2] The more of them France had the better would be the conditions which she could exact at the negotiations.[3] As Mazarin was about to help the Scots to come to terms with Charles, it was reasonable to hope that they would aid him in his difficulties.

New regiments might be raised, but primarily the Cardinal wished recruits for the regiment of the Scottish Guards and for the Douglas Regiment, formerly called Hepburn's. Owing probably to the disastrous defeat at Tüttlingen (Nov. 1643), the Guards had been reduced to 400 men.[4] The Douglas Regiment had not been in Guébriant's unfortunate army, but its ranks had been thinned by various causes, and

[1] See Montereul's letter of credence in *Correspondence of the Scots Commissioners in London, 1644–1646*, ed. H. W. Meikle, Roxburghe Club, 1917, App.

[2] *Bib. Nat. MSS. Français, Ancien St. Germain*, 16002, f. 181. Dec. 14, 1646.

[3] Chéruel, *Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin*, II. 274–5. Dec. 30, 1646.

[4] *Bib. Nat. MSS. Français, Ancien St. Germain*, 16002, f. 300. Mar. 12, 1647.

it now contained only 800 soldiers.[1] Moreover, the Colonel of the Guards, the Earl of Irvine, died in September, 1645,[2] while the Lord James Douglas, Colonel of the Douglas regiment, was killed in a skirmish during the same year.[3] Successors had to be found for the two vacant posts.

The position of Colonel of the Guards was a coveted one,[4] and the Scottish Commissioners in London desired that Sir Robert Moray should obtain it. They suggested to Montereul that no appointment should be made until they had sent a message to France to state their intentions respecting the Guards.[5] Moray himself was anxious to be nominated, and Montereul considered that his pretensions were justifiable.[6] He advised, therefore, that Sir Robert should receive the command ; he was intelligent, a friend of France, and a man who had powerful connections both in England and in Scotland.[7] This advice was taken, and in return for the honour bestowed upon him, Moray engaged to raise 12 companies of 100 men each.[8] Meantime, Lord Angus, brother of Lord James Douglas, was in communication with the French Court as to the command of the other regiment; and, on being appointed Colonel,[9] he agreed to raise 1,000 men.[10] The Scottish Commissioners in London promised that Moray would receive 1,200 soldiers, and Angus "a good number." [11] Thus from 1645 to 1650 Sir Robert's activities, like those of Montereul, were twofold. He played his part in the politics of these years, and he was also busy recruiting for the French service.

The work began in December, 1645, when the French War Minister sent to Montereul a letter of change for 36,000 livres. He was to be very careful in the distribution of this fund

[1] Angus who became Colonel needed 1200 men to reach a total of 2000.
[2] *The Scots Peerage*, ed. Balfour Paul, I. 350 ; *M.C.*, I. 16.
[3] *D.N.B.*, V. 1227.
[4] *M.C.*, I. 30. Oct. 16/26, 1645.
[5] *Ibid.*, II. 569. Oct. 2/12, 1645.
[6] *Arch. des Aff. Ét., Angleterre*, 51, f. 325. Oct. 26, 1645.
[7] *M.C.*, I. 16. Sept. 18/28, 1645.
[8] *Dépôt de la Guerre MSS.*, 94, f. 260. Dec. 1645.
[9] *Arch. des Aff. Ét., Angleterre*, 50, f. 10. Dec. 1645.
[10] *Ibid.*, 50, f. 42. Feb. 8, 1647.
[11] *M.C.*, I. 30. Oct. 16/26, 1645.

None of it was to be handed over either to Moray or to the officers of the Douglas regiment until they had obtained from the Scottish Parliament permission to raise men. For each man levied 30 livres were to be paid, so that Montereul had money for 1,200 soldiers.[1] For somewhat more than a year no progress was made, as Montereul and Moray could not act effectively until they reached Scotland. Owing to their occupation with diplomacy and politics, first at London and then at Newcastle, they were forced to remain in England during the year 1646.[2] Moreover, neither the Committee of Estates [3] nor the Scottish Parliament was willing to permit the levying of men until an agreement had been made with the English Parliament as to the disposal of Charles and the payment of arrears. By the end of January, 1647, these matters had been settled; and, after it had recrossed the Tweed early in February, the Scottish army was disbanded, save for 6,000 foot and 1,200 horse.[4]

Bellièvre and Montereul, however, must have been disappointed, when, even after the disbandment of the Scottish army, the Parliament resolved to permit Moray and Angus to raise only 400 men (Feb. 10).[5] The Estates did not wish to encourage other countries such as Sweden to make similar requests for recruits.[6] But Moray was not dismayed; and in writing to Bellièvre on the 16th of February, he stated that the formal permission was not really essential, and that he would be able to levy men freely.[7] Montereul was inclined to share his optimism as there were so many disbanded soldiers in the country. He therefore gave 18,000 livres to Moray and an equal sum to Angus.[8]

[1] *Dépôt de la Guerre MSS.*, 94, f. 260. Dec. 1645. In 1642 20 livres had been the "*prime*," but out of the 30 livres the price of transport and the cost of change had to be taken. Former levies had been as expensive as this one.

[2] Montereul was in France part of the year.

[3] *M.C.*, I. 201–2, 208.

[4] P. Hume Brown, *Hist. of Scot.*, II. 341.

[5] *A.P.S.*, VI. (i), 689b.

[6] *Bib. Nat. MSS. Français, Ancien St. Germain*, 15994, f. 86.

[7] *Ibid.*, 15994, f. 102. Bellièvre had gone south to London from Newcastle, while Montereul and Moray had proceeded north to Edinburgh.

[8] *Archives des Aff. Ét., Angleterre*, 56, f. 62. Feb. 26, 1647.

In return for this sum Moray agreed in writing either to have 600 men in France by the last day of March or to refund so much of the money as had not been spent.[1] A week later Montereul reported that Sir Robert hoped to have 1,600 recruits in France by the end of May according to promise.[2] In the beginning of March Moray stated that within the same period he hoped to have transported 15 fresh companies ;[3] and in July he held out hopes of sending to France, before the campaign was over, 3 companies in addition to the 16 that he had promised.[4] Angus, at some indefinite date, agreed to disembark 1,200 before the end of June.[5]

Such were the promises made, but the achievement fell considerably short of them. By October Angus had embarked at the most about 950 men and Moray about 1,350.[6] Nor were expectations realised with respect to the limitations in time to which the Colonels had agreed. Instead of having landed 600 men in France by the end of March, Moray had only embarked and sent off about 250. By the end of May he was about 500 short of the anticipated 1,500, and matters were not much improved two months later. Of the 600 which in July he expected to have ready for the closing stages of the campaign probably very few ever reached France ; certainly none arrived in time. Angus had only dispatched about half his men by the end of June, his stipulated period.

The complaints which Mazarin and Le Tellier made from time to time about the slow progress of affairs in Scotland were therefore natural enough.[7] But there were many circumstances which prevented the two Colonels from achieving greater success, and the blame for the delay did not lie with

[1] *Dépôt de la Guerre MSS.*, 102, f. 360.
[2] *M.C.*, II. 29.
[3] *Bib. Nat. MSS. Français*, 15994, f. 111.
[4] *M.C.*, II. 201–3.
[5] *Ibid.*, II. 265–6.
[6] *Ibid.*, II. 201–3, 217–8, 282, 322 ; *Arch. des Aff. Ét., Angleterre*, 50, f. 46 ; *Bib. Nat. MSS. Français*, 4202, f. 217.
[7] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, ff. 48, 49, 86 ; *Bib. Nat. MSS.*, 4202, ff. 178, 261.

them. Adverse winds were very prevalent in the spring of 1647, and these retarded the transport of the men.[1] The plague committed considerable ravages, and Montereul deplored its effect upon the available number of soldiers.[2] But the greatest hindrance lay in the general disposition first of the Parliament and then of the Committee of Estates. The Parliament sat from the 3rd of November, 1646, until the 27th of March of the following year. Thereafter, for eleven months, the Committee held power.[3] It was the Parliament which on the 10th of February had sanctioned the raising of 400 men; but Montereul was afraid that it might hinder further levies, and was greatly relieved when it rose. He hoped that the Committee, a smaller and more select body, would be more favourably disposed. It would be less subject to passion and would be more inclined to weigh the consequences of offending the French Government.[4] He was therefore all the more disappointed when, on the 1st of June, the Committee resolved to prohibit further recruiting. Lanark and Moray tried to render this order ineffective; and by the end of July Montereul hoped that the Committee would not interfere if its order was neglected.[5] Not many men were shipped after that date, and his hopes once more proved excessive.

The reasons for this attitude on the part of the authorities in Scotland were many and of considerable weight. They had to take into account the effect upon the English Parliament of too indulgent a policy towards France. For Spain, which did not wish France to obtain troops in Scotland, insinuated to the English Parliament that the French Government was their greatest foe.[6] Further, Sir Thomas Dishington had informed the Scottish Commissioners in London that the recruits were only being sent to France temporarily; in the near future Moray really intended to utilise them in the

[1] *M.C.*, II. 103, 142.
[2] *Ibid.*, II. 156, 201.
[3] *A.P.S.*, VI, (i) & (ii).
[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 56, f. 105.
[5] *M.C.*, II. 150, 156, 201–03.
[6] Chéruel, *Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin*, II. 412. Mar. 31, 1647.

service of Charles I.[1] This was an untruth which many ridiculed,[2] but which some might be inclined to believe. Moreover, until the end of May, there were Royalist forces in the Highlands, partly belonging to the Marquis of Huntly, partly serving under MacDonald. By the beginning of June the adherents of both these leaders had been defeated;[3] but before the same month was over, the news reached Edinburgh that the army in England had taken possession of the King, and that the Independents had been thereby rendered much more powerful. The question of war with the Independents began to be discussed, and in such circumstances the Scottish authorities were not disposed to let men leave the country.[4]

The fact that Parliament had authorised the raising of only 400 men led to many difficulties. No doubt about 1,900 others were levied, but the task would have been much easier if it had had legal sanction. The Privy Council would have been able to help the officers, as in 1633 it helped those of Hepburn, by issuing extracts and inserting thereon their names for levying their proportionate number of men.[5] It might have given orders that the officers were not to be hindered in their efforts by judges and magistrates, and that magistrates and subjects were even to further the work.[6] There were, for example, soldiers who took pay and then deserted, and in the case of some previous levies it had been one of the duties of magistrates to punish such men.[7] It had not been unusual to keep recruits in prison until the time of embarkation lest they might desert during the interval.[8]

Such help would have been all the more acceptable because the common soldiers were not very anxious to go to France. During the spring of 1647 this reluctance was partly the result of the depredations committed by Royalist frigates,

[1] *M.C.*, II. 70.
[2] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 56, f. 105.
[3] Gardiner, *G.C.W.*, II. 251, 300.
[4] *M.C.*, II. 168, 174–6.
[5] *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1635–37), 401-03.
[6] *Ibid.* (1633–35), 65; (1638–43), 103–04.
[7] *Ibid.* (1633–35), 65.
[8] *Ibid.* (1627–28), Introd. xiii.

which rendered the voyage to France dangerous.[1] But much more important was the fact that after the capture of the King by the Independents war between Scotland and England was possible. The disbanded soldiers chose to await a campaign in England rather than to commit themselves to service on the Continent.[2]

Such were the unfavourable circumstances in which the two Colonels had to labour. Nevertheless, Moray was not wholly beyond reproach. He had been more sanguine than the conditions warranted, and he could not complain if the subsequent disappointment annoyed Mazarin, Le Tellier, and Montereul. In Moray's defence it must be conceded that when in July he spoke of three additional companies besides the promised sixteen, even Montereul himself was of opinion that the Committee would overlook an infringement of its order against the levies. It must also be remembered that the figures quoted above are founded on the reports of the French envoy. In March, 1650, Moray asserted that he had actually sent 1,600 men to France.[3] It must be admitted, however, that Sir Robert had to some extent misjudged the situation, and that his error was the more serious because he was not new to this work and ought to have foreseen the difficulties more clearly.

But the deficiency in the numbers sent and the excessive time taken in sending them were not the only subjects of complaint. Both the authorities in France and the envoy in Scotland discovered, or supposed that they had discovered, various fraudulent attempts and purposes on the part of the two Colonels.[4]

On the 26th of May, Mazarin wrote to Montereul that the

[1] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 55, f. 145.
[2] *Ibid.*, 56, f. 222.
[3] *Harleian MSS.*, 4551. May 26/Ap. 5, 1650.
[4] It should be noted that Le Tellier, appointed War Minister in 1643, had resolved to make it his life-work to abolish the malpractices of officers and men in the French Army. Envoys such as Montereul received strict injunctions to be on the alert in the detection of offences. Montereul, moreover, had failed in his diplomatic work, and when even his parallel task of recruiting appeared likely to prove unsuccessful, he would be inclined to throw the blame on the other agents in the business.

first vessel had contained many incapables,[1] and on the 8th of June Le Tellier spoke of an "*infinité de petits garçons.*" [2] Six weeks earlier, however, both had merely said that there were "several children." [3] Montereul, on receiving this news, went on board the second ship containing 300 of Moray's men which left Leith about the 20th of April. He found "*nombre d'enfants parmi les hommes,*" and he proposed to Sir Robert that his captains should dismiss these incapables. But the captains explained their presence on board.

"C'étaient des lacquais qu'ils prennent de cet âge pour en tirer plus de service ou pour moins charger leurs chevaux, ou des tambours qu'ils ont accoutumé d'avoir ici fort petits, qu'ils habillent de leurs livrées, mais qui ne passent point pour soldats et qui ne reçoivent aucune paye, et Moray a promis d'écrire au Sieur de Rozet,[4] de ne passer aucun de ces enfants pour soldats et de ne donner des armes qu'à ceux qui seront bien capables de s'en servir."[5]

Nevertheless, it is quite probable that there had been an attempt to defraud. Even French levy officers were guilty of this practice, and in 1628 the Privy Council of Scotland had issued an order to check the levying of boys at College.[6] When men were difficult to obtain, it would be the more natural to take mere children as substitutes. On the other hand, Mazarin admitted that the officers of the two Scottish regiments were "as good as there were in France," [7] and this admission needs to be taken into account. Further, the Scottish Colonels made up for the offence by sending good recruits in the future, for Montereul, at the end of July, spoke in praise of the type of men who had been transported to France.[8]

It is now necessary to examine the charges made by Montereul. In the first place, Moray and Angus tried to obtain

[1] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, f. 48.
[2] *Bib. Nat. MSS. Français*, 4202, f. 217.
[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, f. 46; *Bib. Nat. MSS. Français*, 4202, f. 144.
[4] The Commissary who received the troops at Calais.
[5] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 56, f. 124.
[6] *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1627–1628), 7–8.
[7] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, f. 38.
[8] *M.C.*, II. 201–3.

36 livres as the "*prime*" for each soldier, stating that it would be impossible henceforth to levy men at a smaller sum (Feb. 26, 1647). The French envoy pointed out that those who were offering to raise new regiments were willing to accept 30 livres.[1] Although it was natural for those whose offers had not yet been accepted by the French Government [2] to promise to be content with the smaller amount, Montereul's scepticism was justified. Men were forthcoming at 30 livres, and Angus' officers informed the French Resident that their Colonel gave each man somewhat less than 30 livres and retained the balance ![3]

On the 11th of May, 1647, Montereul heard that, owing to the influence of Argyle, the levies were likely to be prohibited after the 1st of June.[4] Moray had commissions for sixteen companies, and for twelve of these he had received levy money. On the 27th of April the French envoy had suggested that he should not be paid for the remaining 400 until they had arrived in France. Sir Robert had agreed on condition that Le Tellier would state whether he really desired this arrangement.[5] But before the 11th of May he requested Montereul to obtain the 12,000 livres from the War Minister. The French Resident, in writing to Le Tellier, hinted that the Colonel, aware that the levies were soon to become illegal, hoped to retain most of this money. This was a most singular interpretation of Moray's request. It would obviously be much easier to raise the 400 men if he could promise that they would receive their "*prime*" before leaving Scotland. Otherwise the 1st of June might arrive before many recruits had been engaged. In the letter containing this accusation Montereul expressed the hope that the approach of the 1st of June would impel the officers to hasten in their task.[6] Yet when a means of advancing the work was suggested, it was treated as a plan to defraud the Government.

[1] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 56, f. 62.
[2] *Bib. Nat., MSS. Français*, 16002, f. 300; *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, f. 74.
[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 56, f. 249.
[4] *M.C.*, II. 141–2.
[5] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 56, f. 124.
[6] *M.C.*, II. 141–2.

The remaining accusations can be briefly dealt with. The 12,000 livres were not sent, and on the 20th of July Montereul expressed his approval. "If Moray received the money of the levies in advance, he might for his own interests not complete the number. Thus on 1,600 men that he agrees to raise he might levy 200 less without any objection being made to it, from an abuse which he tells me is not only allowed, but is very common." [1] In September, he added that any money sent in future to Scotland should be deposited not with "Moray's merchant" but with another Scottish merchant called Dougal. The former "pourrait détourner les traités que j'aurais à faire avec quelque autre que le dit Chevalier." [2] Both insinuations were decidedly ungenerous. If Sir Robert intended to defraud Le Tellier and Mazarin, it was peculiar that he should warn their agent of the malpractice by which he would profit. Moreover, he had already recruited the 1,200 men for whom he had been paid, and 1,100 of them were in France. It was therefore most unfair to suggest that what he had not done in the past he would do in the future. The same remark applies to the other insinuation. No new regiment had yet been raised, but earlier in the year attempts had been made to do so. Moray had interested himself in the matter and had endeavoured to give assistance to Montereul.[3]

Thus the general conclusion would seem to be that of the various accusations Mazarin's probably contained a certain amount of truth and the first made by Montereul was well-founded. But the gravity of the offences committed must not be exaggerated. It is necessary to consider not only how Moray and Angus dealt with the French Government, but also the manner in which the Government treated them. On the whole, the two Colonels, but especially Sir Robert, had a good deal of which to complain. It is true that 36,000 livres were duly forwarded for each of them,[4] and that this

[1] *Ibid.*, 201–3.
[2] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 56, f. 222.
[3] *M.C.*, II. 27–31.
[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 56, f. 91.

sum was adequate for more than the number of men sent by Angus, although not quite sufficient for Moray's recruits. Angus also repeatedly complained that the wages of his men were less than those of Sir Robert's, and this matter seems to have been rectified.[1] Nevertheless, the finances of France were in a bad condition, and it was traditional for the Government to break faith with its military officers. Le Tellier had set himself to a useful task, but he had not been long at work, and he was labouring under serious disadvantages. Abuses were therefore still numerous.

It is instructive to find Mazarin advising his agent to flatter the Scots, if thereby men could be obtained for the French Army.[2] This could only mean that promises were to be made in Scotland which would not be kept in France. The Cardinal assured Montereul that the troops on landing received excellent treatment, and he desired the envoy to announce this to those who had not yet left.[3] In spite of this, rumours came to Scotland that the men were not well cared for. Montereul pointed out the evil effects of such reports, and cynically advised Le Tellier to give orders for the better treatment of the Scottish soldiers until all the recruits had arrived.[4]

But Moray had personal grievances as well. It was hard enough to have to raise 400 men without an advance of money from the Government. Montereul admitted that Scottish Colonels had not been subjected to this condition in the past.[5] Circumstances may have justified the innovation, but nothing could excuse the unfairness with which it was actually carried into effect. In the middle of August Sir Robert sent 100 men to France at his own expense, and he had not been repaid at the end of September.[6] Mazarin did not intend to refund any money until all the 400 had arrived.[7] This was not the way to secure the remaining men.

[1] *Bib. Nat. MSS. Français*, 4202, ff. 132, 144.
[2] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, f. 44.
[3] *Ibid.*, 50, f. 50; *Bib. Nat. MSS.*, 4202, f. 178.
[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 56, f. 168.
[5] *Ibid.*, 56, f. 124. April 27, 1647.
[6] *Ibid.*, 56, f. 222. Sept. 28, 1647.
[7] *Ibid.*, 50, f. 52. Sept. 21, 1647.

In addition, Moray could complain of arrears in his salary and in his pension. He mentions the matter in a letter to Bellièvre of the 29th of May, 1647.[1] But there is more convincing demonstration of it in the caution which Montereul demanded of him in the preceding February.[2] If 600 men had not arrived in France by the end of March, he promised to hand back the unexpended money and not to make use of it in payment of the arrears due to him. Moray cannot, therefore, be very harshly judged if he looked upon the attempt to get more than sufficient levy money as a means of legitimate reprisal.

In regard to another matter, however, it seems at first sight rather difficult to justify his conduct. Few or no troops were sent after the middle of November, 1647, and yet he did not leave for France until the beginning of May, 1648. Now Le Tellier laid great stress upon the presence of commanding officers in the quarters of their troops.[3] These months were, of course, spent in winter-quarters, and Moray could not be accused of avoiding active service. But his regiment and that of Angus were diminishing in numbers, and probably this was due in part to the absence of the Colonels and a consequent lack of discipline.[4]

In point of fact, during the latter half of 1647 and the first half of 1648, Moray did not make his duties as Colonel his sole or even at times his chief object and purpose. This was probably a grievance with Le Tellier, but it was the natural result of his diplomatic activity in 1646. He knew that Montereul suspected him of bad faith in connection with the coming of the King to Newark. The Engagement was a belated movement in favour of Charles I., and Moray doubtless wished to do what he could to further it.[5] Not only did he wish it to be successful; Montereul's reproaches had annoyed him, and he desired to show that they were unmerited.

[1] *Bib. Nat. MSS. Français*, 15994, f. 133.
[2] *Dépôt de la Guerre MSS.*, 102, f. 360.
[3] L. André, *Michel Le Tellier*, 537–546.
[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, f. 17. Nov. 8, 1647.
[5] For his activities in connection with the Engagement, see *ante*, Ch. III.

In reality, Hamilton's policy resulted in disaster. His army was defeated at Preston (Aug. 17–19, 1648), and he himself perished a few months later on the scaffold. Shortly after this, Moray was back in Scotland (March, 1649),[1] where Graymond had replaced Montereul as French Resident. By September, 1648, the two Scottish regiments comprised only 800 men,[2] and Mazarin wished to increase the number by 500 at least.[3] The Peace of Westphalia had been signed, and the Empire and the United Provinces had withdrawn from the conflict ; but the war with Spain still continued, and there was unrest and dissatisfaction in France itself. Hence during the concluding months of 1649 and the first half of 1650, the question of recruiting in Scotland occupied the attention of Graymond, Moray and Angus.

It would be tedious, however, to enter into details. As in the years 1646 and 1647, circumstances were unfavourable to the enterprise. It was constantly expected that Montrose would land with a Royalist force, and the army of 6,000 might have to be increased in order to vanquish him. "Malignants" would not be included in the Scottish host, but they would rather join Montrose than proceed to France. Royalists would be offended if attempts were made to ship such men to the Continent.[4] Moreover, the two Colonels and the French authorities continued their mutual recriminations. Thus Mazarin was annoyed at the demand for a "*prime*" first of 60 livres and then of 45 livres for each recruit.[5] He would consent to no augmentation,[6] although even Graymond admitted that it was natural for the Colonels to demand it. The price of transport had risen since 1647 : in that year there had been disbanded soldiers, while in 1650 it was probable that the Scottish army would be increased.[7]

[1] *Harleian MSS.*, 4551. Mar. 27, 1649.
[2] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, f. 29.
[3] *Ibid.*, 50, f. 105.
[4] *Harleian MSS.*, 4551 : letters of Nov. 13, 20, 27, and Dec. 25, 1649.
[5] *Ibid.*, Dec. 25, 1649 ; Jan. 22, 1650.
[6] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, f. 110. Jan. 29, 1650.
[7] *Harleian MSS.*, 4551. Dec. 25, 1650.

Moray and Angus, on the other hand, bitterly resented an innovation which the Cardinal resolved to introduce. He proposed to send an agent to Scotland expressly to supervise the levying and to distribute the money.[1] The Colonels protested against the plan ; it implied a lack of trust, and if it was carried out they would not levy another man.[2] Moreover, Moray's arrears were still unpaid, and at the end of February, 1650, the Committee of Estates wrote to the French King asking that this might be rectified.[3] An effusive reply was sent on the 10th of May. No definite promises were made, but great regard was expressed both for the two Colonels and for the Scottish nation.[4]

This answer made a favourable impression, and when Graymond asked that some of the prisoners from the army of Montrose should be given to Moray and Angus, the Parliament granted him about 220 men (May 21, 1650).[5] Nine days later 100 more were added.[6] Moray and Angus agreed to send 400 before the end of June at the old rate, although before the arrival of the royal letter they had demanded a considerably higher sum.[7] They embarked the troops with all speed, and by the 4th of June 300 of them were on their way to France. The rest were to follow before long.[8]

Graymond left for France shortly after,[9] and there is no more mention of the levies. Charles II. had signed the Treaty of Breda on the 1st of May, and he arrived at Speymouth on the 23rd of June. War with the Commonwealth would be the inevitable sequel, and every available man would be required for the contest against Cromwell. It was probably about this time that Moray resolved to quit the French

[1] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, ff. 111, 112, 113. Feb. 25 and April 6, 1650.
[2] *Harleian MSS.*, 4551. March 26, April 9, 1650.
[3] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 60, f. 252. Feb. 26, 1650, Letter by Moray ; *Harleian MSS.*, 4551. Jan. 22, 1650.
[4] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 60, f. 282. May 10, 1650.
[5] *A.P.S.*, VI. (ii), 566.
[6] Sir J. Balfour's *Annals*, IV. 18–19.
[7] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 60, ff. 300, 313. May 30, 31, 1650.
[8] *Ibid.*, 60, f. 328.
[9] *Harleian MSS.*, 4551. Aug. 21, 1650 (Letter of Graymond from Paris).

service. His arrears were still unpaid.[1] France was in the throes of rebellion, for the Fronde was at its worst from 1650 to 1653. There was no likelihood of obtaining satisfaction so long as it lasted,[2] and it might continue indefinitely. His acceptance of the position of Justice Clerk in March, 1651, and his appointment in June as a Lord of Session point to some such resolution on his part.[3] The disaster at Worcester subjected Scotland to a foreign rule, and Moray did not perform any judicial functions. But he remained in the country to take part in the Royalist Rising against English domination. Whatever, therefore, his intentions may have been, his connection with the French army did actually terminate in 1650. This was fortunate. The future of his regiment and of most foreign regiments in France was not to be of long duration. Le Tellier resolved to give his country a national army, and gradually the number of foreign troops diminished.[4] The Scottish Guards existed only until 1662.[5] Rutherford was their last Colonel,[6] but it is uncertain whether he was Moray's immediate successor.

[1] *Cf. post*, Chap. VI. p. 99.
[2] L. André, *Michel Le Tellier*, 271–80.
[3] *A.P.S.*, VI. (ii), 648b, 686b.
[4] L. André, *op. cit.*, 232–4.
[5] F. Michel, *Les Écossais en France*, II. 288, *n.* 2.
[6] *Ibid.*; *Miscellany*, Camden Socy., VIII. Rutherford's Letters; *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 68. Mar. 13, 1658, Rutherford to Mazarin.

CHAPTER V

1652–1655

THE GLENCAIRN RISING

When Cromwell left Scotland in pursuit of the army which he was to overwhelm at Worcester, he assigned to Monk the task of coping with the Scottish forces which remained in their own country. Beyond the Tweed, as well as in England, the Commonwealth troops were successful. Stirling Castle surrendered on the 14th of August; Dundee was stormed on the 1st of September; while somewhat later Montrose and Aberdeen submitted.[1] In the north Huntly disbanded his forces in November, and Balcarres his regiment of horse in December.[2]

Thus the Lowlands of Scotland had been conquered before the end of 1651. On the 21st of April, at the Market Cross of Edinburgh, there was read the declaration for a union and for the election of a committee to approve of the details. But it was clear that neither Remonstrants, Resolutioners, nor Royalists were contented in their subjection. This was the more serious because the Highlands were not yet reduced to obedience. During the summer and autumn of 1652 Deane and Lilburne were engaged in trying to effect this, and on the 19th of August as well as on the 27th of October, the former compelled Argyle to enter into an agreement that he and his clan would submit to England. But, in spite of this, the Highlands as a whole were not yet conquered. By this time, moreover, the attention of the Commonwealth Government was chiefly occupied with the Dutch War

[1] S. R. Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate* (1903 edn.), II. 66–68.

[2] J. Lamont, *Diary*, Maitland Club, Edin. 1830, 37.

which had broken out at the end of June.[1] In these circumstances there were many in Scotland who thought that another blow ought to be struck before the country submitted finally to English dictation. The Glencairn Rising was the result.

In the revolt Moray played a considerable, though not wholly consistent, part; and from this point of view the movement may be divided into four definite periods. Firstly, there is the period from the spring of 1652 until April 1653, during which Charles II. continued to receive messages and advice from various Royalist groups or individuals and had to choose among the different courses proposed. The second extends from the summer of 1653 to the close of the year. Charles had adopted a policy which did not commend itself to the majority of his advisers in Scotland, and this divergence of view now led to unfortunate results. Then, during the early months of 1654, Moray was suspected of being an accomplice in a design to assassinate the King. Finally, his connection with the concluding stages of the revolt must be traced from June, 1654, until April, 1655.

By March, 1652, Charles had received the first of a series of messages from Scotland. In that month an agent of Lord Balcarres, called Knox, arrived in Paris in the company of Middleton. He assured the King on behalf of the Lords in the Highlands that they "would never swerve from their duty," and he spoke with considerable bitterness against Argyle. In June some Highland chiefs and certain Lowland nobles intimated that they were prepared to resume the contest against the Republic, and in consequence Charles appointed Middleton to be Lieut.-General. The Highlanders, not hearing from Charles, grew impatient at his silence, and in October, Smith, Glengarry's agent, was in Paris, urging the King to send commissions to certain chiefs, and asking that Middleton might be dispatched to Scotland.[2]

Meanwhile the Lowland Royalists were not idle. It is

[1] Gardiner, *C. and P.*, II. 135–9; *Polit. Hist. of Eng.* VII. (Montague), 391.

[2] *Clar. MSS.*, Bodleian, XLV. 370. C. H. Firth, *Scotland and the Commonwealth*, Scot. Hist. Socy., 1895, 137.

impossible to say what part Moray had taken in the earlier months of the year. From June, 1651, till June, 1652, there is no trace of his movements. Probably he was associated with the doings of his brother-in-law, Balcarres. In any case, early in July, he arrived in Edinburgh with his wife, and soon after Tweeddale (who was not in town) put at their disposal some rooms in his Edinburgh house, of which Anne Murray, the future Lady Halkett, was also an inmate. Balcarres, Dunfermline, Sir James Halkett, and Sir George Mackenzie of Tarbat were all in the capital, designing to serve the King, and their meetings were held in Moray's rooms. The group soon learned that Colonel Bampfield was in the north of England and anxious to join them. This interesting but sinister character was distrusted by Charles, who considered him to be a traitor. Moreover, Bampfield had declared his belief that his wife was dead, and he had already made advances to Anne Murray. Sir Robert was convinced of the Colonel's innocence, alike in his public and in his private capacity. Through Anne Murray, he invited Bampfield to proceed to Edinburgh. A lodging was provided for him near Tweeddale's house, to which he repaired every evening. " After they had formed their design in the most probable way to be successful, they found it necessary to be armed with the King's authority for what they did, and therefore sent to acquaint his Majesty with what they intended, and to desire commission for several persons nominate and some blank for such as might afterwards be found fit for the employment." The material part of these letters " was writ in white ink, and what was writ in ordinary ink was only to convey the other without suspicion.[1] The letters

[1] *Memoirs of Lady Anne Halkett*, Camden Society, 1875, 73, 77–80. Anne Halkett (1622–99) was one of the most remarkable Scottish women of the century. She left about twenty volumes in manuscript, mostly dealing with religious questions. A volume of her works was published in 1701, but the most interesting of them, her Memoirs, was first printed at length in 1875 by the Camden Society. In these Lady Halkett gives a very graphic picture of the earlier portion of her life, especially of her love affairs. Until 1650 she lived in England, but in June of that year she came to Scotland to try to obtain the recovery of the portion left her by her mother (*D.N.B.*, VIII. 932).

must have been written before the beginning of November, for on the 8th of November "Balcarres left Balcarres and went to St. Andrews to dwell with his whole family." [1]

It required considerable courage to engage in such a transaction in the capital. Discovery would have led to unpleasant results, and the fear of detection did for some time weigh upon the group. Sir George Mackenzie had chanced to see in a stationer's shop a book in which directions were given as to how "to write without being discovered." To his no small alarm he found that the author recommended precisely the method which they had chosen in their addresses to the King. Moray, however, pointed out that "if that book came into the English hands, they would not believe anything so common as to be in print would be made use of in any business of consequence." Still, it was a relief to hear that the King had received the letters. He had complied with their desires and was to send the commissions with a safe hand to the north of Scotland. Sir George Mackenzie and Colonel Bampfield were appointed to go north, presumably to receive them, and Moray had some thoughts of accompanying them.[2]

The departure of all three was delayed by an unfortunate event. On the 25th of December Sir Robert and his wife, Anne Murray and her future husband, made merry over a Christmas meal. In the house was a woman reputed to have the gift of second sight, and, according to Lady Halkett, she prophesied that their joy would soon be changed to grief. A few days later Lady Moray, who was pregnant, "took her pains, but they all struck up to her heart, and all means being unsuccessful, she died, with as much regret as any person could have" (Jan. 2).[3] She displayed great fortitude, and her husband maintained a somewhat unnatural calm. He "sat constantly upon her bedside feeling her pulse, and exhorting her cheerfully to endure these moments of pain, which would soon be changed to everlasting pleasure. And

[1] Lamont, *Diary*, Maitland Club, Edin. 1830, 49.
[2] *Memoirs of Lady Anne Halkett*, 80–2.
[3] *Ibid*; Lamont, *Diary*, 52.

though no doubt her death was the greatest misfortune could arrive to him, yet he did speak so excellently to her as did exceed by far what the best ministers said who frequently came to her; and was so composed both at and after her death, that neither action nor word could discover in him the least of passion." The body was conveyed to Balcarres by night and interred there on the 10th of January.[1] Moray did not permit his personal loss to prevent him from fulfilling what he considered his public duties, and early in February, 1653, he followed Sir George Mackenzie and Bampfield to the north.

Balcarres himself had been in bad health even before the death of his sister, and he continued to be so for some months.[2] Nevertheless, he wrote twice to the King. His first letter reached its destination about the 10th of January, and it is impossible to say what suggestions it contained. The second, the bearer of which was called Roger, is dated the 23rd of February.[3] In the course of it, Balcarres explains that his health will not permit of his going to the King, as he had been invited to do. He pleads with Charles to look with favour upon Bampfield, and recounts the latter's activity in the royal cause. He indicates that Glengarry will probably not submit to Middleton's leadership, and declares that on no account ought any Highland chief to be authorised to command the others. It was already April before Roger arrived in the French capital.

If Balcarres was not physically capable of taking the field, Glencairn, a Cunningham from the south, was able and willing to do so. Before the 7th of March, Strachan, an

[1] *Ibid.*, 52. *Cf. Scots Peerage*, ed. J. Balfour Paul, I. 519.
Lady Moray was born in 1624 and thus died at the age of twenty-eight (*Scots Peerage*, I. 519). Probably the marriage had taken place not long before. By the end of 1650, Moray had terminated his connection with the French army and this step may have been partly due to his intention of marrying.

[2] *Clar. MSS.*, XLV. 151, 324; Firth, *S. and C.*, 97, 130.

[3] J. Maidment, *Historical Fragments*, 47–54. But *cf. Clar. MSS.*, XLV. 324. "Roger . . . sailed, as I remember the 8th of February." (Sir R. Moray to the King, April 22, (?) 1653.) Seaforth's letter is dated April 22, and although Moray's is not dated, it must have been written about the same time.

emissary of his, reached Paris, urged Charles to hasten Middleton's departure for Scotland, and explained that Glencairn meanwhile was willing to join "those of the Highlands," to make other levies and conduct them till the General's arrival.[1]

Some considerable time elapsed before "those of the Highlands" sent another and a final messenger to the King. On the 22nd of April Seaforth and the heads of certain clans wrote from Glenelg; about the same time Moray also wrote.[2] Both letters were carried by Bampfield, who left for the Continent accompanied by Captain N. Macleod and Captain Shaw. Like those of Balcarres and Seaforth, Sir Robert's letter begins with a glowing account of the Colonel's loyal services and with the expression of a desire that the King will give entire trust to him. Thereafter, he proceeds to inform Charles that the chief men have formed themselves into a Council of War, that this step has been taken with the consent of all his Majesty's servants in Scotland, and that they would like to have a royal confirmation of its authority. On the other hand, the writer is conscious that the arrangement is not ideal, for he advises the speedy sending of someone to command. Until this is done, there will not be the requisite secrecy of plan and action. Only thus will a check be put on the differences that arise between men who are loyal to their sovereign but unwilling to submit to each other. Nobody will be averse to Middleton's coming in that capacity, and, in fact, most people will be pleased. None but Middleton, however, will be welcomed as commander. Balcarres, in his February letter, had spoken in favour of Lorne. Moray does the same, but he writes with greater enthusiasm. He even defends the attitude of Argyle, who will join the movement when in his own judgment he can do so securely and effectually. Finally, he advises the King to write to certain eminent subjects of his in Scotland. As Bampfield visited various European countries on his way to France, it was autumn before Charles received the two letters.

[1] *Clar. MSS.*, XLV. 370; Firth, *S. and C.*, 138.
[2] *Ibid.*, 322, 324; Firth, *S. and C.*, 127–8, 130.

Hence, before the end of March, when he decided what course to follow, Charles had been advised both by the Glengarry and by the Edinburgh group to send commissions to certain persons in the Highlands, while Glencairn had offered to act as a temporary leader. The letters borne by Roger and Bampfield arrived too late.

It is now necessary to consider the attitude of the King and his advisers, Hyde and Middleton, towards those various propositions and requests. On the 30th of December, Charles signed a commission appointing MacDonald of Sleat, MacDonald of Glengarry, Lochiel, Keppoch, Fraser, and Donald Gorme MacDonald, "commissioners for the management of the Royalist forces in Scotland until Middleton's arrival." [1] He believed that the chiefs would be offended if he were to name a temporary leader, but he resolved to send instructions advising that such a leader should be chosen. The commission and the instructions were sent to Middleton for his judgment. He frankly admitted that he did not approve ; a temporary leader ought to have been definitely appointed.[2]

It was early in March before Hyde replied to him. By this time Strachan had come from Glencairn, and Charles had heard that Bampfield was in the secrets of the Scottish Royalists. He was not long in deciding what to do. He resolved that Smith should be sent to the chiefs with the commission, but he also addressed certain instructions to Glencairn. On arriving amongst the Highland chiefs he was carefully to observe their attitude. If he saw they might "be dexterously led to do that of their own choice which would be best for themselves," he was to cause to be handed to them a letter from the King. Glencairn was to obtain a copy of this letter, which recommended him as a fit substitute for Middleton. If it was evident that the party would hold together without a leader and that the suggestion of one would do harm, he was not to interfere but was to co-operate with them either in the Highlands or in some other part of

[1] *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, ed. Macray and Coxe, 1869, II. 165.
[2] *Clar. MSS.*, XLV. 128 ; Firth, *S. and C.*, 89, 90.

the Kingdom. Should he see that the lack of headship could only result in disunion and disaster, and that the chiefs could not be persuaded to elect him, then Glencairn was to produce an absolute commission appointing him to direct the royal forces.[1]

Middleton was anxious that neither Smith nor Strachan should leave for Scotland until Roger had arrived. It was known that he was on his way. To this proposal both the King and Hyde objected. They felt that the sooner Bampfield was prevented from doing mischief, the better it would be for the cause. A warrant had been issued for his arrest. For some days, however, they deferred to the General's wish. Middleton also proposed that the names of Balcarres, Seaforth, and Pluscarden should be added to the list of commissioners. This was granted, but by the end of March Charles ordered the dispatch of both Strachan and Smith. Roger had not arrived, but a letter from Balcarres to Dysart (Jan. 24, 1653) containing praise of Bampfield, had been forwarded to Paris. That which Roger was bringing would presumably be in the same strain.[2]

Although Moray's letter of April had no influence in determining the King's policy, it is of interest as showing the condition of the Royalist party during the early months of 1653. It corroborates Lilburne's letters of February and April.[3] The English commander had not yet realised that the Rising was one of considerable moment. The Lowlands, he says, are quiet, and even the Highlanders do not seem to think of taking the offensive. The English victory over the Dutch at sea has checked their zeal. Moray admits that the Royalists have not accomplished much. But he hopes that the Declaration[4] " will supply that failing and give a high reputation to your Majesty's affairs abroad." He refers to a bond of union and demonstrates its utility, for it is intended to secure mutual aid and protection by the different parts of

[1] *Clar. MSS.*, XLV. 149–50; Firth, *S. and C.*, 99, 101.
[2] *Clar. MSS.*, XLV. 131, 176, 193, 370; Firth, *S. and C.*, 94, 104, 106, 138.
[3] Firth, *S. and C.*, 84, 95, 122.
[4] J. Maidment, *Historical Fragments*, 25–43. A Declaration explaining the motives of the Rising and the method in which it was to be conducted.

the country. In the meantime, the leaders have resolved to pursue a defensive policy. Horses are badly needed, and also arms for the foot-soldiers; war-ships are necessary for the defence of the western coast; and the Dutch might be induced to engage more heartily in the King's cause by the offer of some territory in the western islands.

By the month of June, Glencairn, Balcarres, Lorne, Loudoun, Athole, and Forbes had taken the field, and many more had joined them. It was now less easy to maintain the wisdom of a defensive policy, but Glencairn and Moray were at one in restraining an untimely zeal for the offensive that might have proved disastrous.[1] It was resolved, therefore, to defer aggression until Middleton should arrive and bring with him the means for striking eventually with greater effect. Forays into the Lowlands in order to seize horses and to demand money constituted the sole activity of the Royalist forces until the close of the year.[2]

Thus far harmony seemed to prevail among the leaders of the army in the Highlands. Smith had delivered the King's commission to those who had dispatched him. By the 13th of June Glencairn seems to have been chosen as leader, and some time appears to have elapsed before this led to disunion. It would seem that at first the dissension was between the Highland and the Lowland element in the army. Balcarres, for example, is said to have been robbed of two horses by the clansmen. A Letter of Intelligence declares that the Lowland lords are endeavouring to increase their strength to secure themselves against the Highlanders.[3] But soon the dissension is between Glencairn and those who, whether Lowlanders or not, are annoyed at his elevation to the supreme command.[4] On the 9th of August Balcarres wrote to Charles expressing not only his discontent but his intention of journeying to Paris.[5] By the 11th of September (N.S.)

[1] Firth, *S. and C.*, 150.
[2] Gardiner, *C. and P.*, III. 91.
[3] Firth, *S. and C.*, 143, 160, 185.
[4] R. Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, Ban. Club, 1841–42, III. 250–1.
[5] *Thurloe State Papers*, ed. T. Birch, I. 495.

Middleton had received letters from Scotland which stated that Glencairn would be greatly discouraged if the King showed favour "to Bampfield or to any other from Sir Robert Moray or of that faction." In the middle of November Bampfield wrote from Paris to the Earl of Dysart.[1] He had received a letter from Sir Robert, who complained of Glencairn's appointment. What had the latter done during the initial stages of the revolt, or in what way was his interest in the Highlands sufficient to warrant his nomination to the temporary leadership? The writer had expressed the hope that in the future wiser counsels would be adopted in Paris. Neither he nor those who thought with him, however, were permitting their discontent to slacken their energy in the King's business.

Before September was over, therefore, Charles had heard from various quarters of the discontent in the Scottish Highlands. He tried in two ways to diminish the evil. In the first place, he wrote letters to Balcarres and to Moray.[2] To the former he stated the reason which had weighed with him in appointing Glencairn. Not only had Balcarres been in bad health, but he had reposed too much confidence in Bampfield. In the Earl personally he had the greatest faith, but he could not say the same of all the Earl's associates. In any case, it was now too late to alter the decision which he had taken, and he hoped that Balcarres would be reconciled to the inevitable. The continuance of dissensions could only bring disaster on the cause for which all were working. In a note written two days later, Charles referred to the Earl's intention of coming to Paris. He gave no encouragement to the idea, but said that if Balcarres still resolved to come, he was at least not to bring Dunfermline with him.[3] To Moray a letter was written on the 1st of November, and although there is no trace of it, it must have contained some plain speaking, for it caused him considerable pain.[4]

[1] *Nicholas Papers*, ed. G. F. Warner, Camden Socy., 1886–92, II. 21, 28.
[2] *Thurloe State Papers*, I. 495; Firth, *S. and P.*, 49; *Clar. MSS.*, XLVIII. 3.
[3] Thurloe, I. 502–3.
[4] *Clar. MSS.*, XLVIII. 3; Firth. *S. and P.*, 49.

As the mere writing of letters to the malcontents seemed insufficient, the King also dispatched emissaries to Scotland early in November. The chief of them was Wm. Drummond, whose instructions are dated the 2nd of November. He was to assure Glencairn of the continuance of the royal favour and to advise him to welcome all who were now willing, whatever their past conduct had been, to serve under his command. But he was to exercise severity against continued insubordination. Drummond was to express to Balcarres also the King's friendly feelings, but at the same time to dissuade him from setting out for Paris. Another of the three couriers, N. Macleod, received instructions of a similar tenor on the same date.[1] It is important to notice that the letter to Balcarres was intercepted, and that Moray's was not received till early in February, at which time Drummond arrived in Scotland.[2] Charles' measures therefore had practically no effect.

Meantime, Moray and Balcarres were not the only offenders. During the autumn of 1653 Lorne had quarrelled at various times with Kenmure, Glengarry, and Glencairn;[3] and there were other chieftains who shared his discontent. Owing to the nature of the war, moreover, the Royalist army was divided into numerous portions. Doubtless, as Gardiner suggests, this kept personages apart who would otherwise have quarrelled. But it removed them from adequate control and enabled them to take individual action without the knowledge of the commander and contrary to his desires. A notable example of this was furnished in November. In that month Seaforth, Lorne, Lochiel, and eight other chiefs addressed a letter to the King.[4] They mention that they have desired Balcarres and Moray to proceed to Paris, where they will give Charles a faithful account of affairs in Scotland. In addition, they will offer his Majesty counsel and advice which the King will do well to take. For indeed none can

[1] *Clar. MSS.*, XLVII. 7, 9; Firth, *S. and C.*, 246, 250.
[2] Probably Macleod reached his destination somewhat earlier.
[3] Gardiner, *C. and P.*, III. 93–4.
[4] Lord Lindsay, *Lives of the Lindsays*, 3 vols., London, 1849, II. 100–101.

be more capable of giving good advice. The letter is in great part a eulogy on the conduct of the two friends and testifies to their ardent and successful endeavours in the cause. His Majesty does not, however, need this testimony in the case of two men whom he esteems so highly, and therefore the writers conclude, after protesting that they will never relax in their efforts to serve their sovereign.[1]

The emissaries were also to take with them certain Instructions, and upon these were founded the proposals which Balcarres made to Charles in May, 1654. The chief proposals were the following :—[2]

(*a*) " It is humbly offered to your Majesty's consideration, if it be not necessary presently to send into Scotland some person who is not particularly interested in the debates that have been about the management of your affairs in that kingdom," who may bring directions to rectify any errors committed and to encourage " your faithful servants."

(*b*) " If it be not fit to send such a commission as is herewith offered for the ordering such affairs as are of common concernment and do not immediately relate to the conduct of your forces."

(*c*) "That your Majesty write . . . to Middleton and command him to endeavour . . . the reconciling of all differences that have been, or are, amongst your faithful subjects . . . "[3].

[1] Lord Lindsay, who quotes this letter (*Lives*, II. 100), suggests that it was written after Middleton's arrival in Scotland. This is impossible. By that time Scottish Royalists knew of the charge of treason against Sir Robert Moray, and none of them would have used such terms in writing of him to the King. Besides, Balcarres who carried the letter to Paris had left Scotland before Middleton arrived. Of the Instructions which he took with him there is only a copy. He says of it, " This very individual paper is that I gave his Majesty a little after my arrival in Paris. It is founded upon the instructions I had, and contains all the desires I brought from those were engaged in his Majesty's service in Scotland." Hence when we find in the copy the following phrase, " the names of such persons of eminence as were engaged in your Majesty's service *before Middleton's arrival*" (*Hist. Fragments*, 60), the conclusion to be drawn is that Balcarres owing to change of circumstances had been forced to alter the words of the original. It does not imply that when he left Scotland, the General had arrived.

[2] J. Maidment, *Historical Fragments*, 57–62.

[3] The first proposal, as submitted in May, clearly implies a doubt with regard to Middleton's ability to carry out the policy suggested under the third head. In November, it was probably thought that the General's coming might be delayed and that some one else must be sent in the interval. The

This meeting of the factious was not to remain a secret. On the 26th of November the *Mercurius Politicus* reports that "in order to heighten and inflame the people, they [the Royalists] give out that Balcarres and Sir Robert Moray are gone to fetch their King to them." [1] On the 30th of November Lilburne wrote to Cromwell to the same effect.[2] Neither writer, however, seems to be aware of the real circumstances under which they had been dispatched. Towards the end of the year Glencairn sent Strachan to Paris. In his Instructions he writes: "Show Newburgh that he obviate any credit to be given to a paper which Balcarres has purchased under the hands of several Highlanders, which most of them have done out of weakness." [3] Hence he knew something about the proceedings of the group, but he can hardly have been aware that the two emissaries were to go to the King. This is clear, for by the 9th of January Strachan was in Paris,[4] and on the same day Charles wrote to Middleton advising his speedy departure for Scotland and requesting him when he arrives there to do all he can to reconcile Glencairn and Balcarres.[5]

However much the malcontents protested their zeal for the King, the prosecution of the royal cause must have been greatly hindered by their actions. This is the more apparent when we reflect upon Lilburne's position during the latter half of 1653.[6] He had in all Scotland only 12,000 foot and about 2,000 horse. Many of his officers had taken advantage of quiet times and gone to England. The pay of his troops was in arrears; and until the Dutch war should be over, the

second proposal was impracticable, and to that extent it was a blow at Middleton's authority as General. For what affairs did not "immediately relate" to the conduct of the forces? Again there is the question, what did the proposal imply in November? Was it to be acted on even after Middleton should arrive? It is quite possible that those whom Balcarres represented would not have approved of his proposals when presented in May.

[1] *Spottiswoode Miscellany*, II. 142; Thomason Tracts, Brit. Mus., E. 723.
[2] Firth, *S. and C.*, 283.
[3] *Clar. MSS.*, XLVII. 189; Firth, *S. and C.*, 308.
[4] *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, II. 299.
[5] *Clar. MSS.*, XLVII. 258; Firth, *S. and P.*, 5.
[6] Gardiner, *C. and P.*, III. 92, 94.

Commonwealth Government seemed little inclined to listen to his warnings and demands. Moreover, the attitude of the country generally was favourable to the Rising. From the people in the Lowlands, the English found it impossible to extract information as to the movements and the doings of the Royalists. A considerable success might lead to a general rising. In fact, minor successes had not been infrequent, and more would have been achieved had there been loyal unity of action.

Doubtless Glencairn was quarrelsome and a difficult man with whom to co-operate. His conduct after Middleton's arrival points to this. Besides, he must have known or he ought to have known that the majority of the Scottish Royalists desired no temporary leader, and yet he offered to occupy that position. They were ignorant of his proceedings, and when they at last were enlightened, a certain amount of discontent was perhaps natural. The King's letters, too, of October and November [1] either did not arrive in Scotland at all, or were belated. Nevertheless, it is impossible to justify the course of action followed by Balcarres and Moray from July to November, 1653.[2] They had advised that the conduct of the war till Middleton's arrival should be in the hands of a plurality. They declared that if one were appointed to command the others, quarrels would be the only result. But it was obvious that these would arise in any case. Even Moray admitted the benefits of unity in command; yet the sole conclusion he drew was that Middleton should be sent as soon as possible. A strong leader might prevent dissension, and for Balcarres and Moray to protest after Glencairn was nominated was only to precipitate what they feared would be the result. In self-defence they might have said that they would have submitted to the King's will had he chosen some other person. It is true that they had been

[1] See *ante* pp. 86, 87.

[2] Balcarres was the worse offender and seems to have exercised over his relative a powerful but unfortunate influence. He played the part of an inveterate grumbler as long as the Rising lasted. Sir Robert's conduct after his brother-in-law left for France was exemplary. In Paris Balcarres probably demanded more than was desired by those whom he represented.

more active than Glencairn in the earliest stage of the Rising. But if Glencairn was too weak for the position, that was only an additional reason why he should receive their support, and although he did prove unable to maintain order, Middleton himself had no small trouble when he in turn took the command. Moreover, if the King was not to choose Glencairn, whom was he to appoint? Balcarres had expressly stated that no Highlander must be chosen, and the Lowland lords had given their opinion in favour of a collective command. Charles therefore could not appoint Balcarres or any other member of the group which met in Edinburgh in the autumn of 1652.

It is generally futile to defend the conduct of those who do not defend themselves. But, as it happens, Moray did write an apology for his actions. The King's letter of the 1st of November reached him on the 4th of February, and he replied to it on the 21st of the same month.[1] The reply is by no means convincing; there is too much rhetoric in it. His serious arguments are two in number. In the first place, Balcarres and he had not known his Majesty's wishes. It is evident, however, that they must have known what Charles desired, at least after Glencairn had been forced to show his absolute commission.[2] Now it was after this that Balcarres wrote in discontent to the King, and that they were both appointed emissaries by Lorne and Seaforth. Secondly, in ignorance of the King's wishes, they could not be expected to applaud what they knew would lead to disaster. Nevertheless, Moray admitted in his letter of April, 1653, that unity of command should be instituted as soon as possible. It ought to have been clear by the autumn that Middleton's coming might be long delayed and that meanwhile a substitute was necessary.

The King's letter would never have been written had Charles not been annoyed, and he had some reason for his resentment. He was consequently already prejudiced against Moray when, in December, 1653, two letters were sent to him

[1] *Clar. MSS.*, XLVIII. 3; Firth, *S. and P.*, 49.
[2] R. Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, III. 250–1.

by a certain Lady Page. Both of them were dated the 19th of November. One was that letter of Bampfield to which allusion has already been made ; [1] the other purported to be written by Sir Robert, and its contents implied that he was engaged in a plot for the assassination of the King.[2] Both the documents which came to the King's hands were copies, and while Charles wrote to thank Lady Page for having sent them, he asked that the originals might be forwarded.[3] He seems, indeed, to have been doubtful about the authenticity of Moray's letter.

" It may be," he wrote to Middleton, " the sight of . . . those letters . . . will hasten your repair home ; where you see how great a combination is entered into, at least against my business, if not against my person, and in the meantime I hope you have sent to my Lord Glencairn . . . to be careful in the examination of the whole matter, and in the prevention of any mischief."

A few days later his scepticism had increased. Bampfield had confessed to his letter, but Dysart declared that he had never seen that from Sir Robert. Lady Page had gone to a merchant's factor in Antwerp and desired him to write for her a letter which she dictated. She said that she had sent the original of it to the King. Dysart had seen a copy under

[1] See *ante*, p. 86, *n.* 1.

[2] *Nicholas Papers*, ed. Warner, II. 27–28. Sir Robert Moray to Wm. Murray (Earl of Dysart). " Sir, I have received yours of the first of this month to the great content of myself and your friends ; we had not received one letter from you in six weeks before. Bampfield has satisfied me of your resolution for France, at the which I was troubled, by reason that I could not dispatch our friend so soon as I desired, though he hath been long in readiness for that undertaking. But I thought it fit to see a little more of our neighbours, which indeed are very strong and resolute, and, if Middleton prevail before our friend comes into those parts, our business will be checked for the present. As soon as he comes, he shall give you a true account of all things. We all desire that you would be pleased to dispatch him as soon as you can, but be not seen to go with him, nor stay nor (*sic*) long after him where you are ; for we think not fit that you should be there, when he puts this business in execution, but that you would move slowly towards France. I have never yet seen a man undertake a business with that cheerfulness. Our friends here do assure me that he will find no hard task in this matter, by reason that sometimes for his pleasure he goes so slightly guarded. Sir, I think it very necessary that you should furnish him with money enough that he may have no want of that. I have no more for the present, but pray for our success and your Lordship's health. . . . Robert Murrey. Scotl., 19 Nov., 1653. For the right hon. the Earl of Dysart in Antwerp."

[3] *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, II. 288.

the same hand, and when the copy and the alleged original were compared, they were found to be both by one person. Moray's correspondents asserted also that the handwriting of the alleged original was not his. Therefore Hyde wrote advising Middleton to take care that "there be not such a proceeding in Scotland to the prejudice of Sir Robert, as if the letter were assuredly written by him"[1]. Charles was not yet wholly convinced of his innocence, but the written declaration of Lady Page of the 29th of January, 1654, must have tended to dissipate his remaining doubts.[2] In spite of this, however, Hyde in writing to the Lieut.-General on the 6th of February does not suggest that the latter need make no further inquiry.[3]

Probably Moray would never have been suspected of treason if he had worked in harmony with Glencairn. For the question arises, how was it that Lady Page resolved to affix his name to her own production? She herself was a disreputable woman and had been the mistress of Dysart. He had begun to neglect her and she desired to have her revenge.[4] She may have obtained knowledge of Sir Robert's relations with Bampfield, and she would be aware that Bampfield was distrusted by the King. The Colonel's letter to Dysart[5] came under her notice, and in it Moray was represented as a malcontent. Lady Page seems to have concluded that the letter could be attributed to him with some show of probability.

He was soon to experience the unpleasant results of his earlier policy. It is possible that he would not have done so, had he accompanied Balcarres to the Continent. In that case, he would have been able to justify himself to Charles in person instead of being subjected to the inquisitorial zeal of an official. The King could interpret matters leniently;[6] a

[1] *Clar. MSS.*, XLVII. 258, 278; Firth, *S. and P.*, 5, 11–13.
[2] *Nicholas Papers*, II. 56–8.
[3] *Clar. MSS.*, XLVII. 355; Firth, *S. and P.*, 33–4.
[4] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 106.
[5] See *ante*, p. 86, *n.* 1.
[6] *Clar. MSS.*, XLVIII. 202b, Hyde to Nicholas, May 15, 1654, Paris: "We know nothing here of Sir Robert Moray's imprisonment, more than

commissioner, in his own interest, would tend to do the reverse.[1] However, Moray remained in Scotland, and what he must have considered the most disagreeable event of his life was now about to befall him. Burnet's version of it is as follows :—

" Sir Robert Moray was in such credit in that little army, that Lord Glencairn took a strange course to break it, and to ruin him. A letter was pretended to be found at Antwerp, as writ by him to Wm. Murray. . . . He [Wm. Murray] had a lewd creature there, whom he turned off : and she, to be revenged on him, framed this plot against him. This ill-forged letter . . . was brought to the Earl of Glencairn : so Sir Robert was severely questioned upon it and put in arrest : and it was spread about through a rude army that he intended to kill the King, hoping, it seems, that upon that some of these wild people, believing it, would have fallen upon him without using any forms. But upon this occasion, Sir Robert practised in a very eminent manner his true Christian philosophy, without showing so much as a cloud in his whole behaviour."[2]

Burnet's assertion that Moray was imprisoned is confirmed by the gossip of Royalist letters written in May,[3] and by the fact that the accused wrote with unusual vehemence to protest his innocence.[4] But the question who effected the arrest is more difficult to settle. It was believed in Paris (May 15) that Glengarry was the agent in this matter,[5] but he could only be acting under orders either from Glencairn or Middleton. To one of them it must be attributed.

Hence it is obvious that the date of the arrest is also conjectural. Nor is there any certainty as to the duration of

what my Lord Balcarres received from his friends, who say it is by my Lord Glengarry upon the letters sent over, and if there be no other cause, I conceive Middleton hath discharged him since he came thither."

[1] It is not easy to determine why Moray did not proceed to France. Probably Balcarres and he agreed that it would only prejudice their enterprise if it involved the absence from Scotland of two important Royalists.

[2] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 106. *Cf.* with the last sentence in the quotation Appendix D, *post*. Moray's letter in self-defence is sufficiently stormy.

[3] *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, II. 347, 353.

[4] *Balcarres MSS.*, Advocates' Library, Edin., vol. IX. See *post*, App. D.

[5] See *ante*, p. 93, *n.* 6.

Moray's imprisonment. The emissary Strachan, who had accompanied Middleton to Scotland, had returned to the King a considerable time before the 3rd of April.[1] As Charles was very anxious for news about Middleton, he would dispatch Strachan to Scotland very speedily. Probably the emissary had reached the Royalist army early in April. During part of his stay in the north Sir Robert was a prisoner, and, according to Moray himself, Strachan was " very kind to me at a time when I was treated as if I were a traitor." [2] It is hardly credible, however, that the imprisonment lasted until towards the end of May,[3] when Middleton, Seaforth and Athole wrote to the King from Wick letters of which Strachan was the bearer.[4]

He arrived in Cologne in July or August, and he may have had with him the letter which Moray wrote in self-defence. No doubt Strachan would speak in his favour to the King; this would be the natural sequel to that kindness which he had shown to Sir Robert in Scotland. Nevertheless, although by the middle of May Charles was presumably convinced of Moray's innocence, he seems to have regarded Balcarres and his associates with disfavour as late as November, 1654.[5] This is implied in the Instructions which in that month Balcarres gave to Knox. The Earl, of course, was attempting to explain the failure of his mission to those who had sent him, and he would be inclined to exaggerate the influence which false reports about Glencairn's opponents had exercised upon Charles. At any rate, the bad impression created by factious doings in the earlier period of the revolt could only be removed through a course of action distinguished by loyal obedience and by the fulfilled purpose of being among the last to relinquish the royal cause. Moray's conduct in the closing stages of the Rising was of this exemplary nature and would no doubt receive its due recognition.

[1] Firth, *S. and P.*, 68.
[2] *L.P.*, 23119, f. 53.
[3] *Cf. ante*, p. 96, *n.* 6.
[4] *Nicholas Papers*, II. 67, 70; Firth, *S. and P.*, 109, 116–7.
[5] *Clar. MSS.*, XLIX. 131; Firth, *S. and P.*, 209–11.

Unfortunately, there is no word of him until December, 1654, when the Royalist cause was manifestly doomed.[1] Where had he been in the intervening months? Under whom had he been serving? From the notices of him in December and the three subsequent months, he was evidently in Middleton's confidence,[2] and this can hardly have been won without previous co-operation of a loyal kind. The only alternative would have been to join Glencairn, who had left the General about the end of April.[3] This would not have recommended him to Middleton, nor was it a course which he would naturally choose.

The new Royalist leader was abler than his predecessor, but he had to cope with Monk instead of Lilburne. Monk was not only more capable than Lilburne, but he was more efficiently supported by the English Government, which was now relieved of the incubus of the Dutch War. His demands for reinforcements were complied with, and he knew how to utilise improved circumstances. After making a practically impassable line between Highlands and Lowlands, Monk came into touch with the Royalists at Loch Garry and there inflicted on them a signal defeat (July 19, 1654).[4]

From August to December Middleton wandered about in the Highlands. Before the end of September Glencairn, Montrose and others had come to terms with the enemy.[5] In these circumstances, at a council of war held early in December, the small band which still accompanied Middleton resolved to enter into negotiations with Monk. These proved abortive as the Royalist envoys refused to agree to the forfeiture of the estates of Middleton, Moray, and other prominent supporters. But there was no hope of continuing the struggle, and during the month of May, 1655, Lorne,[6] Lochiel, Reay, and Selkirk made their peace. Monk, how-

[1] *H.M.C. Reports*, XI. App. Pt. VI. *Hamilton Papers*, 136.
[2] *Ibid.*, 136–8.
[3] *Cal. Clar. S.P.*, II. 372.
[4] Gardiner, *C. and P.*, III. 102, 105, 107–10.
[5] Firth, *S. and P.*, 158, 165, 173–7, 187.
[6] Moray gave him some friendly hints how he should proceed in the matter of a treaty. *Hamilton Papers*, 138.

ever, seems to have been unwilling to deal in the same generous fashion with Middleton and Moray. On the 12th of April he heard that the Royalist General was still in the hills. Ten days later he learnt that he had gone to sea, a piece of news confirmed early in May. On the 17th of April Middleton wrote to Lorne from Paris. Of Moray there is no trace, but he probably accompanied his leader. It would be natural for him to proceed to the French capital, for there he would find both Lord and Lady Balcarres, whom he had not seen for the space of a year.

The end of the Rising was not a great event in Scottish history, but it marks an important point in Moray's public life, which may be said to extend from 1638 to 1673, a period of 35 years. His military activity now comes to an end. Henceforward, he is a stranger to the camp. The next five years were to be spent in exile, and for the most part as a studious recluse. During that period Moray had time to add greatly to his stores of knowledge, and to merit the distinguished position which he was to hold in the scientific world of the Restoration epoch.

CHAPTER VI

1655–1663

EXILE—THE RESTORATION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND

THE five years which followed Moray's flight from Scotland in the spring of 1655 were passed in exile. It has been seen that he probably went in the first place to Paris. In August, 1656, he was at Bruges, where Charles was living at that time.[1] Almost a year later he left the Hague for Maastricht (July 3, 1657),[2] where he spent a considerable time. From his letters to his friend Alexander Bruce, we learn something of his surroundings and occupations from 1657 to 1659. He was "nailed" to the place, and could not even visit his friend during a severe illness which the latter contracted at Bremen. What it was that so hampered his movements he does not state. He would rather have been in Scotland than "anywhere out of heaven." But if he had gone there, he would have been "laid up in Jenny Cutler's press" upon the least surmise of invasion or tumult.[3]

In Maastricht his surroundings were pleasant and his occupations congenial. He had rooms near Kirk and Market and a good hostess. He rarely went out unless to Church, where the sermons he heard were delivered by good preachers, sometimes in English and sometimes in French. Visitors seldom crossed his threshold, and he did not cultivate the society of the place. He had two or three cousins in the town, and one of them was married to the Commander. At her residence he occasionally spent a day, but on the whole he was "a very hermit."[4]

[1] *Thurloe State Papers*, ed. T. Birch, V. 315.
[2] *K.P.*, July 2, 1657.
[3] *K.P.*, Nov. 8, Dec. 31, 1657.
[4] *K.P.*, Sept. 22, Dec. 4, 1657; Feb. 26, Mar. 23, 1658.

His occupations, however, were not exactly those of a hermit. He read books on all kinds of subjects; he wrote letters to Balcarres at the Hague and to Bruce at Bremen; he kept in touch with the political movements of the time, and especially he was zealous in chemical researches. "You never saw such a shop as my laboratory is." [I am] "sitting at the cheek of a furnace that will gar your eyen reel when you see it." He was a lover of music, but "to tell you truly I am not much for cultivating of music till God send me days of joy and mirth, if indeed he hath marked out any such for us. Nor do I mean to take them to myself till he give them to others and me both. I think I may say I have as much of that science as may serve to recreate myself, yet I let it quite rest." [1]

Financially, he was in an unpleasant position. Mazarin owed him 130,000 livres for past services, and in March, 1658, he wrote to the Cardinal about the matter. He had to borrow from friends, but his own debtor was deaf to appeals.[2] Perhaps it was to argue with him in person that Moray left Maastricht for Paris, where he arrived before the 12th of September, 1659. If so, he must have been disappointed with the result. There, too, he heard of the death of Balcarres, which occurred at the Hague on the 30th of August.[3] But if he had personal griefs and troubles, the prospect of the Restoration was a great compensation. During the spring of 1660 he eagerly watched the development of affairs beyond the Channel, although he did not allow his hopes to outmarch the facts of the situation.[4]

It was in connection with the Restoration both in England and in Scotland that Moray once more became involved in politics.[5] It would appear that this did not particularly attract him. "I have no stomach to public employments,"

[1] *K.P.*, Nov. 27, 1657; Mar. 9, Ap. 8, 1658.
[2] *Ibid.*, Mar. 23, Dec. 18, 1658, *et seq.*, *passim*; April 9, 1660.
[3] *Scots Peerage*, ed. Balfour Paul, I. 520.
[4] *K.P.*, March 12, 1660.
[5] *Ibid.*, same date. There was at this time some talk of Moray accompanying the Duke of York, who, it was rumoured, was about to obtain the position of "General of the Forces in Spain by sea and land."

he wrote to Bruce (March 12, 1660); and in another letter to the same correspondent he says:

"For myself, I do just as I use to do, let things work out of themselves. You may perhaps think I should look after that station consigned me at home.[1] But I will tell you by way of anticipation: that although as things went with me then, I suffered my friends to do for me what relished with them, I never thought to exercise the function of a judge, not only because I think myself every way absolutely unfit for it, but especially because I am averse from all public employments, especially of that kind."[2]

On the other hand, if his services were required, he did not intend to remain in a selfish privacy;[3] and as a matter of fact, his political activities from 1660 to 1663 were considerable. He shared in an endeavour to facilitate the Restoration; he exerted himself in connection with an attempt to render it acceptable to English Presbyterians as well as to Anglicans; and he played a part in the strife of factions in Scotland. The first two tasks were completed before his return to England; thereafter, Scottish questions began to claim his attention.[4]

Although the Restoration was inevitable after the death of Oliver Cromwell and the abdication of his son, yet contemporaries were astonished that it was so easily effected. Among the various obstacles that might have retarded it were the rumours about the religion of Charles II. It was given out that he had become a Catholic during his wanderings in foreign countries. This was suspected by Dutch Protestants as early as 1658, and Charles thought it advisable to deny the charge in a letter to the Presbyterian minister of the English congregation at Rotterdam. In 1659 Morley

[1] That is, in 1651. See *ante*, Chapter IV. p. 76; III. p. 61.

[2] *K.P.*, May 20, 1660.

[3] *Ibid.*, June 9, 1660.

[4] This is true for all practical purposes. Before his return, he expressed in letters to Bruce his views on the policy that ought to be adopted in Scotland. These views were essentially sane and just. He seems to have written to leading men expressing them and advising their adoption, but, as the future showed, it must have been without success. See *K.P.*, May 20, 1660.

wrote in the same manner to the Dutch minister at the Hague.[1] But it was of greater importance to contradict the report in England and in Scotland. Lauderdale made himself conspicuous in this matter, and "spread abroad mighty commendations of the King, both as to his temper and piety."[2] One of the grounds for the suspicion was the fact that in 1652 Charles on Hyde's advice had refused to attend service at Charenton, the centre of Protestant France.[3] Lauderdale felt that the ministers of the Church there could give the most authoritative denial to the charges.

Not only was it desirable that they should deny the truth of the inconvenient rumours, but there were many reasons why the Huguenot clergy would be willing to help Charles at this turning-point in his fortunes. The years from 1630 to 1660 form a distinct period in the history of the French Protestant Church, and the historians of the sect have generally looked upon it as a pleasant epoch between times of trouble. By 1630 Richelieu had crushed the Huguenots as a political force, and thereafter they ceased to revolt against the central power. The number of noble adherents diminished, but the Huguenots achieved success and gained wealth in the sphere of trade and commerce. Since they were no longer a menace, they received better treatment from the Government. The Catholic clergy still regarded them with the old hostility, but its hatred was almost impotent to change the attitude of the civil power. Between 1630 and 1652 three national synods were allowed, although a Royal Commissioner had to be present at the meetings. In the latter year Louis XIV. delighted the Protestants still further. They had refused to take part in the Fronde, and they now obtained the reward of their discreet loyalty. The Edict of Nantes was confirmed by a Declaration, and future violations of Huguenot privileges were to be punished. But within four years the Declaration was cancelled, for it had given

[1] D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, 1732–8, IV. 235–7.

[2] R. Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae*, 1696 fol., 215–216.

[3] Clarendon, *History of the Rebellion*, ed. W. D. Macray, Bk. XIII. 131–134.

dangerous offence to the Roman Church. From 1656 onwards the attitude of the Government was increasingly hostile, and the Protestants had to submit to many minor annoyances. Between 1656 and 1660 various blows were struck at the organisation of their Church. Colloquies were prohibited; and although after a lapse of fifteen years a National Synod was permitted to assemble at Loudun in November, 1659, yet the members were told before its conclusion on the 10th of January, 1660, that they had taken part in the last of the series.[1] The future, therefore, must have appeared ominous; and if the French Protestants could help to effect the Restoration of Charles II., they might hope for his intercession with Louis XIV. in the future.[2]

At any rate, Lauderdale resolved to make use of them, and it was Sir Robert Moray together with the Countess of Balcarres whom he chose as his agents.[3] By the 12th of March Moray could report to Alexander Bruce: "With this next post there goes over 4 or 5 very good letters from three of the ministers here [Paris], and others of other places, wherein they say handsome things of the King's firmness to our religion."[4]

There were five ministers in the Church at Charenton, and the three whom Sir Robert persuaded to write were Raymond Gaches, Jean Daillé, and Charles Drelincourt. All three, but especially the two latter, were men of note in their time. Daillé had been moderator of the recent National Synod, and had a reputation for learning and eloquence. Drelin-

[1] Roughly speaking the National Synod corresponded to the General Assembly of the Scottish Church, and the Colloquies to Presbyteries.

[2] G. de Félice, *Histoire des Synods Nationaux*, Paris, 1864, 226–243; H. M. Baird, *The Huguenots and the Revocation*, London and New York, 1895, I., Bk. II., Chs. VII. and VIII. G. Weber, *Geschichtliche Darstellung des Calvinismus im Verhältnis zum Staat in Genf und Frankreich bis zur Aufhebung des Edikts von Nantes*, Heidelberg, 1836, 266–276.

[3] "He by means of Sir Robert Moray and the Countess of Balcarres then in France procured several letters to be written from thence, full of high eulogiums of the King and assurances of his firmness in the Protestant religion, which he got translated and published." (Baxter, *Reliquiae*, 215–16.) Lauderdale must have been still in prison: he was not released till March.

[4] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 159, *n.* 1.

court was the most gifted of the three, and his talents as a preacher, controversialist, and devotional writer excited the admiration even of the sceptical Bayle. "Ce qu'il a écrit contre l'église romaine a fortifié les Protestants plus que l'on ne saurait dire : car avec les armes qu'il leur a fournies ceux même qui n'avaient aucune étude tenaient tête aux moines et aux curés." [1] It is clear that if such a man denied the charge made against Charles, his statement would carry weight. Their letters were written between the 23rd and the 28th of March ; [2] and on the 25th of April Hyde was assured that "the ministers of Rouen and Caen, in imitation of those in Paris, have written to their friends in England to disabuse the people of those absurd and malicious aspersions which are cast on the King." [3]

The burden of the letters may be briefly stated. The religion of the Prince was hardly a matter for the interference of his subjects. In any case, Charles had made no public confession of Catholicism, but he had frequently acknowledged his Protestantism. He had shown much anger at attempts to convert the young Duke of Gloucester to the faith of Rome. It was true that he had not been willing to worship at Charenton, but his reluctance was due to political and not to theological considerations. This was the more credible, because Charles had attended service in the Churches of Rouen and Caen, and he had listened to the discourses of Morus in Holland. Moreover, he was not only sound in his beliefs, but his piety was known to such as were in intimate relations with him.

These letters were addressed to various persons, Baxter among others, and after translation they were published. Baxter's comment on the result of Lauderdale's activities is brief but definite : "The fears of many at that time were

[1] Eugène et Émile Haag, *La France Protestante*, 9 vols., Paris, 1846–59, IV. 180–6, 310–17.

[2] D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, IV. 235–7.

[3] *MS. Calendar of Clarendon MSS.*, Bodleian Library, Milton to Hyde, April 25, 1660.

much quieted." [1] Probably this is not an exaggeration. It is true that the majority of the people were eager for the restoration of the monarchy, and they can hardly have been in a mood to put much faith in what was only surmise. Nevertheless, it would be a relief to hear from Drelincourt and his friends that Charles was not a Catholic, although it must have been difficult to believe that he was pious. The testimony to his piety was, indeed, indiscreet, unnecessary, and dishonest. Both Moray and the ministers must have known that Charles was extremely immoral. On the other hand, their belief in his Protestantism was probably genuine, for none of them belonged to the innermost circle of the King's acquaintances. In their opinion Charles would not be likely to endanger his chances of Restoration by a mistimed conversion.

On the 25th of May, 1660, the King landed at Dover and the Restoration was an accomplished fact. For the moment nearly everyone was enthusiastic; but it was impossible that this state should continue. The various sections of the nation were full of antagonistic hopes, and the expectations of some of them would inevitably be disappointed. All that the King and his counsellors could do was to pursue a policy that would content the greatest possible number. It was the religious settlement that would prove most difficult. The Presbyterians and the Anglicans had combined to restore the monarchy, and the former were quite aware that their system of Church Government could not be imposed on the nation as a whole. Either they would be persecuted, or they would be tolerated, or they might be enabled to join the Anglicans on the basis of a moderate Episcopacy. Even before Charles had left Holland, some of the Anglicans made it clear that they favoured the first of the three policies.[2] Charles personally desired the adoption of the second, but as he wished to make it operative for Catholics and sectaries as well as for Presbyterians, the latter were inclined to oppose

[1] *Op. cit.*, 215–6.
[2] *MS. Cal. of Clarendon MSS.*, Hyde to Barwick, April 16, 1660.

it.[1] Hence a large section of them, headed by Baxter, Reynolds, and Manton, were eager for the realisation of a "comprehension" scheme. During the month of April they conferred with Anglicans like Morley and Gauden, but the meetings ended in general talk about the desirability of peace and union. Charles in his Declaration from Breda promised "liberty to tender consciences," but with a necessary qualification which detracted considerably from its value. It was natural, therefore, that some of the Presbyterians should distrust both him and the Anglicans. For this party the "comprehension" scheme had little attraction, not only because they had conscientious objections to it, but also because it seemed destined to failure.[2]

Nevertheless, the choice lay between persecution and comprehension, and efforts must be made to persuade them that the scheme was neither sinful nor impossible. There was ample time for such endeavours, for the religious question would be among the last to be settled. Lauderdale and Crawford-Lindsay did what they could in England,[3] but once more it was deemed necessary to utilise the services of the Huguenot clergy. It was not Lauderdale who took the initiative on this occasion, but one called Brevint, a native of Jersey, who had been a voluntary exile.[4] While in France he had been a Protestant minister in Normandy and had acted as chaplain to Turenne. As recently as March, 1660, he had become a prebendary at Durham.[5] At his instigation the Countess of Balcarres requested some of the Huguenot clergy to write in favour of Episcopacy as a form of Church Government. This must have been before the middle of May, as the Countess had returned to England by the 17th of that month.[6]

She left her task unfinished, and it devolved upon Moray

[1] Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, III. 348 *et seq.*
[2] Baxter, *Reliquiae*, 1696 edn., 215–7.
[3] *MS. Cal. of Clar. MSS.*, Massey to Hyde, March 23, 1660; Barwick to Hyde, April 10, 1660.
[4] Airy, *L.P.*, I. 28–30.
[5] White Kennet's *Register*, 1728, fol., 395; A. Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 1721 edn., II. col. 927.
[6] Lord Alex. Lindsay, *Memoir of Lady Anne Mackenzie*, Edin. 1868, 49.

to attempt the completion of it. At first, for reasons unstated, he had not been disposed to approve of the undertaking. Before long he was convinced of its desirability, and on the 7th of June he wrote a long letter to Lauderdale, describing what he had done to further the matter, and how it would possibly terminate. If the Provincial Synod, which was to meet at Charenton in July, would declare for Episcopacy, then English Presbyterians might be more easily led to accept comprehension as the basis of a settlement. Charles might be induced in the same way to favour the scheme. It would have been better for a National Synod to make the desired Declaration, but National Synods were forbidden for the future. If Lauderdale thought fit, he could tell Charles that some of the ministers as individuals were already writing letters in favour of a moderate Episcopacy. Moray had asked Gaches and Drelincourt to let him speak to them and their colleagues together, but he had not yet been granted the opportunity that he desired. To Morus,[1] one of the pastors at Charenton, he had given a paper "with five queries, comprehending the chief points wherein the two governments of Church and State have clashed amongst us." He wished "to have their sense of them." In spite of all his labour, however, he could not definitely promise that the Synod would do what was desired. It might not do so even if Charles favoured it with a letter, but if a letter were not sent, little hope need be entertained.[2]

In the National Synod of 1637 and in the final one of 1659 the royal Commissioner had forbidden the Protestant Church to have intercourse with foreign countries, even on purely ecclesiastical matters.[3] It was not to write to any corporate body outside the realm (*à aucun corps hors du royaume*). It was presumably for this reason that Sir Robert insisted on the necessity of a letter from Charles. If the King wrote to

[1] For Morus see Haag, *La France Protestante*, VII. 543–548.

[2] Airy, *L.P.*, I. 28–30.

[3] H. M. Baird, *The Huguenots and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, I. Bk., II. Chap. VII. 364. *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, 1st series, XIV. (1865). Lettre de Daillé au Doyen de l'Église de Zurich. (See Table of Contents.)

request the favour of a Declaration, Louis XIV. would perhaps overlook an infringement of his order. On the other hand, Charles could hardly be expected to do this without the certainty of a Declaration in response. He would probably offend the French monarch and he might gain nothing in return. As the contemporary records of the Church of Charenton have been lost,[1] it is impossible to say what took place at the meetings of the Synod, but it certainly never made the Declaration which Moray had solicited.[2]

Thus the sole result of his activity was that certain clergymen, such as Du Bosc of Caen, de l'Angle of Rouen, Gaches and Drelincourt, wrote as individuals. John Durel, in his *View of the Government and Publick Worship of God in the Reformed Churches* (1662), quotes letters by these four to Brevint.[3] He gives the date of that by Du Bosc as the 14th of June, 1660, and the other three are inserted without a date. Still it is almost certain that they are the letters which Moray mentioned to Lauderdale, for they are addressed to the prebendary of Durham who had suggested the plan. All four write in favour of moderate Episcopacy, and some of them attribute to accidental circumstances the fact that their own Church polity excluded the rule of bishops.

Even if Sir Robert had been able to obtain a Declaration from the Provincial Synod of Charenton, the effect could hardly have been important. The majority of the Anglicans were resolved to have nothing to do with comprehension, and Charles did not intend to quarrel with them about the matter. He could not do so indeed without thwarting the will of Parliament. As to the Presbyterians, who had scruples about comprehension, they would not have been convinced by the Declaration of a single Provincial Synod, even the leading one of Charenton. It is very doubtful whether they would have yielded to the opinion of a National Synod.[4] As

[1] *Bulletin de la Soc. de l'Histoire du Prot. Français*, vol. 37 (1888), 667.

[2] If it had done so, there would have been extant copies of it in England.

[3] Pp. 122–148. Durel was minister at the Savoy.

[4] *Cf.* Wodrow, *History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*, I. Introd. xix. Douglas in his letters to Sharp speaks slightingly of the need of bringing foreign divines into the ecclesiastical discussions of Britain. April 24, 1660

it was, four pastors out of seven hundred [1] had stated their private opinion, and it was easy for foreigners to suppose that they did not express the general attitude of the Huguenot Church.

This supposition would not have been just or correct. The Presbyterians in Britain were in reality much less liberal than their French brethren both in regard to doctrine and to their judgments on ecclesiastical politics. In the Huguenot community there were three theological centres—Sedan, Montauban, and Saumur. The two former represented the Calvinistic tendency, while the latter had affinities with Arminianism. It was Saumur which swayed the bulk of Huguenot opinion.[2] Moreover, the Church as a whole was perfectly free from aversion to Episcopacy on theological grounds.[3] Thus the ministers who had complied with Moray's desire were not guilty of an attempt to deceive English Presbyterians as to the real attitude of French Huguenots. Consequently, Sir Robert himself was not guilty of complicity in such a deception. Like Baxter he was genuinely anxious for the success of the comprehension idea. He had travelled and lived abroad too much, and he had too modern an intellect, to suppose that one form of Church Government was more sacred than another. The best was the most expedient, and for England in 1660 the most expedient was a moderate Episcopacy.

Hence it did not follow that this system of Government was desirable for Scotland, to the affairs of which Moray began to devote his attention after his arrival in London at some

[1] *Bulletin de la Soc. de l'Hist. du Prot. Fr.*, XV. (1866), 511. A list of Reformed Churches and Pastors in France in 1660.

[2] P. D. Bourchenin, *Études sur les Académies Protestantes en France au 16me et au 17me Siècle*, Paris, 1882, IVe sect., 395–463.

[3] See H. M. Baird, *The Huguenots and the Revocation*, I. Bk. II. Chapter VII. John Durel's book already cited (p. 107) amply bears this out. So also does an anonymous publication of 1660—*Histoire des Nouveaux Presbytériens Anglais et Écossais, et de leurs différences d'avec ceux de France*, par M.F. (Bib. Nat., Nf. 407). It is noteworthy that Monteith of Salmonet, in his *Histoire des Troubles de la Grand'Bretagne* (pub. 1661), speaks of Puritans as follows in his Preface: "Je n'entends nullement comprendre sous ce nom aucuns Protestants de deça la mer. Car encore qu'il y'en ait qui n'ayent point d'évêques ni de Chapitres, ils ne tiennent pourtant pas que l'Épiscopat soit un ordre anti-chrétien, contraire à l'Évangile, . . . et ainsi des choses semblables qui passent pour des points fondamentaux parmi ces Puritains."

time between the end of June and the beginning of August.[1] Both on the 7th of June and on the 29th, he had written from Paris, stating that he had heard that Lauderdale was to summon him "by order." On the latter date, he declared that he would be ready to depart on two days' notice, but on the former, that he was not anxious to leave Paris unless he should be asked to do so.[2] In this respect he was a great contrast to the large number of his countrymen who hastened southwards to London even before the King's return to England, eager for places, pensions and favours.[3]

He was, however, nominated to certain official posts early in 1661. On the 13th of February he was appointed a Lord Ordinary of the Court of Session [4] and a Privy Councillor,[5] and on the 30th of February a Lord of Exchequer.[6] The post of Justice-Clerk seems to have been bestowed on him even before the 13th of February.[7] With one exception these appointments were honorary, for until 1667 Sir Robert did not reside in Scotland.[8] But his residence in London enabled him to attend the meetings of that section of the Council which held its sittings there. This was the portion of which Clarendon, Albemarle, Ormonde, and Manchester were members, and which really dictated to the Edinburgh section the policy to be adopted in Scotland.[9]

The acceptance of office implied a liability to the subscription of certain oaths. During its first session the

[1] *K.P.*, letter from London by Moray, Aug. 3/13, 1660.

[2] Airy, *L.P.*, I. 28–30; also *L.P.*, 23114, f. 13. A few remarks in the *K.P.* (May 20, June 9, 1660) give the probable reason. There seemed at last to be some hope of receiving a portion of his arrears from Mazarin. He wished to await the Cardinal's return to Paris: the latter had been in the south of France.

[3] J. Nicoll, *Diary*, Ban. Club, 1836, 282, 295; J. Kirkton, *Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland*, ed. C. K. Sharp, 1817, 60, 66–7.

[4] *A.P.S.*, VII. 124.

[5] *R.P.C. of Scot.*, I. 3rd series (1661–64), 1–4.

[6] J. Nicoll, *Diary*, 336.

[7] In his appointment as Lord Ordinary on that date he is styled Justice-Clerk. He had, of course, been appointed Justice-Clerk in 1651, but so also to the position of Lord Ordinary. If he needed re-appointment for the one place, presumably he required it for the other also.

[8] *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1665–69), 294, June 20, 1667, his first attendance at a meeting of the P.C. in Edinburgh.

[9] *Ibid.*, I. 3rd series (1661–64), Introduction vi.

Scottish Parliament enacted that all office-holders should take the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy (Feb. 27, 1661), and in the course of the next session it passed the Declaration (Sept. 5, 1662).[1] The latter asserted the illegality of the National Covenant, of the Solemn League and Covenant, and of rebellion generally. Row states that Crawford-Lindsay, the Treasurer, was asked to take the Declaration before the middle of June, 1663, and that Moray had not done so by that time. According to the same authority, he thought that it would be sinful to do so, but Sir Robert was certainly not of this opinion in 1667.[2] The members of the Council resident in Scotland did not take the Declaration until November, 1663,[3] and thus it is possible that Row is right with regard to that year. Still, it is difficult to see why, if Crawford-Lindsay was requested to subscribe it, Moray should have escaped. Lindsay was a more important politician, and the Middleton faction hoped thus to oust him from his office. But Moray was of sufficient importance to have been "billeted" along with the Treasurer, and as that method had failed, it would be natural to try another. Probably it was felt that Sir Robert would not refuse to take the Declaration, and it is assuredly impossible to suppose that he considered such an action sinful. It is evident from his letters to Lauderdale in that very year that he believed in the necessity of an absolute monarch for Scotland.[4] To one who held this view the Declaration could present little difficulty.[5]

It does not follow that he approved of the policy of administering oaths such as he was personally willing to take. In any case, he did not approve of all the Acts of the Scottish Parliament which sat from the 1st of January to the 12th of July, 1661. He regarded its proceedings from the point of view of the Lauderdale party which was opposed to that

[1] *A.P.S.*, VII. 44, 405.
[2] W. Row, *Continuation of R. Blair*, Wodrow Socy., Edin., 1848, 439, 510.
[3] *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1661–4), Introd. xiii.
[4] Airy, *L.P.*, letter LXXXI.
[5] *K.P.*, July 9, 1663, Moray expresses disapproval of Crawford-Lindsay's action.

of Middleton. Charles had divided the chief official positions between the two groups. Middleton, the Commissioner, was supported by Glencairn, the Chancellor, by Primrose, the Clerk-Register, and by Newburgh, the Captain of his Majesty's Guards. Crawford-Lindsay, the Treasurer, followed the lead of Lauderdale, who was Secretary of State. Rothes, the President of the Council, was not yet a declared supporter of either party. Clarendon and the English Bishops favoured Middleton, for the Commissioner desired not only to uphold the royal prerogative in civil matters, but also to restore Episcopacy. He intended to impose fines on a large number of persons, and to withhold from them the advantages of the Act of Indemnity until the sums were paid. That Act itself was to be deferred until the ecclesiastical settlement had been decided upon. Lauderdale, on the other hand, anxious for a Presbyterian settlement, was hostile to the Act Rescissory (March 28, 1661). Moreover, he looked with disfavour upon the policy of imposing fines, and he did not approve of English interference in Scottish affairs. With respect to the royal supremacy in civil matters he was as zealous as his rival, and therefore he had no opposition to offer to the Acts by which it was secured. The bulk of the nobility sided with Middleton; the hopes of the Presbyterians centred in Lauderdale.

All that Lauderdale and his friends could do was to attempt to dissuade the King from following the counsels of the more violent party. Resident in London, and a favourite with the King, Moray would be in a position to influence the mind of Charles; and the fact that his name was on the list of the "billeted" implies that he had shown himself a dangerous antagonist of the Middleton group. This is borne out by the scanty indications which we possess of his actions during 1660 and 1661. Those who, owing to their past, had cause to be dubious as to their future, made use of him as a mediator between them and the King or Lauderdale.[1] It is true that

[1] *L.P.*, 23116, f. 27. Loudoun to Lauderdale:—Moray can tell Lauderdale how Loudoun has concurred in measures of the Scottish Parl. for restoring the Crown to its old powers. *Corr. of the Earls of Ancrum*

he was not always for mild courses and the pardon of past offences. Two years later the fate of Wariston had to be decided. Charles was determined that he should die, and on this occasion Sir Robert agreed with Lauderdale that the King's will must be accepted.[1] At this time Lauderdale was in the midst of his struggle for predominance over Middleton (July, 1663), and to have shown an inclination to favour Wariston would have diminished his chances of success. Intercession would have been vain, and might have led to a prolongation of Middleton's tyranny in Scotland.

As early as 1661 Moray had expressed himself with great frankness to Brodie about Wariston and the "fanatics," by whom he presumably meant the Protesters.[2] He felt that their conduct would inevitably tend to bias the King in favour of a restoration of Episcopacy, and that it would increase the difficulties of the Presbyterian party among the Scottish politicians in London. Their task was already sufficiently arduous, but it was not until August, 1661, that the Council in London came to a definite decision.[3] The Scottish Parliament had risen on the 12th of July, and on the 13th Middleton had started for London. He had been preceded by Rothes, Glencairn, and Sharp (April, 1661).[4] All four advised Charles to reintroduce the Episcopal form of Church Government. It was desired by the greater and more honest part of the nation. Only the Protesters were against it, and very few of the Resolutioners would oppose it. These views were supported by Clarendon and Ormonde. Lauderdale, on the contrary, asserted that there was still a strong prejudice in Scotland against Episcopacy, and that

and Lothian, Ban. Club, 1875, II. 450:—"Desire Tweeddale to make way for me with Lauderdale and S. R. M. that by their means I may find that acceptance which is desired." Alex. Brodie to Lothian, July 29, 1661. G. Mackenzie, *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland*, 1821 edn., 73. Charles "ordered that the late remissions granted to disaffected persons by S. R. M.'s mediation should be recalled." This was late in 1662.

[1] Airy, *L.P.*, I. letters XC, XCI. See also *K.P.*, July 16, 1663.

[2] Alex. Brodie, *Diary*, Spalding Club, 1863, 223–224, July 26, Nov. 4, 1661.

[3] *R.P.C. of Scot.*, 3rd series (1661–4), 29. Letter of Lauderdale, Aug. 14, 1661.

[4] *Polit. Hist. of Eng.*, VIII. (Lodge), 36; J. Nicoll, *Diary*, 340.

the King would only lose the affection of the nation were he to do as Middleton proposed. At any rate, he ought first to make inquiries as to the real state of Scottish opinion. A General Assembly or Provincial Assemblies could be held; at the very least, prominent divines could be summoned to Westminster. Crawford-Lindsay was definitely hostile to the idea of restoring Episcopacy, while Hamilton and Moray, like Lauderdale, suggested delay until the desire of the nation had been ascertained. Charles, however, followed the advice of the Middleton party; and the Privy Council in Edinburgh on the 5th of September passed an Act re-establishing the Episcopal form of government.[1]

Middleton and his supporters must have known that they were exaggerating the number of those who desired the downfall of Presbyterianism; nevertheless, there were many in Scotland who were not hostile to Episcopacy.[2] Nor would hostility to the change necessarily imply active resistance to it, for the Presbyterians were divided among themselves and the nobility was no longer on their side. Much would depend upon the manner in which the Episcopal system was introduced, and if wisdom were shown in this matter, no evil results might ensue. Lauderdale and his supporters seem to have been doubtful even as to this. Certainly they had good reason to believe that Middleton and his friends were not the men to adopt the moderate measures which alone might prove successful. On the whole, therefore, the King would have done better to listen to their counsels.

Contemporary Presbyterian writers accused Lauderdale of not having stated his views with sufficient emphasis, and doubtless they included his supporters in their charge.[3] But too much zeal would only have done harm. The majority

[1] For the discussion in the Council at London, see G. Mackenzie, *Mem. of Affairs of Scotland*, 52–56; Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 233–36.

[2] Presbyterian writers admit this with regret. R. Wodrow, Introd. xv., P.S. of a letter from Douglas to Sharp of March 31, 1660; R. Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, Ban. Club, 1841–42, III. 417–18; W. Row, *Continuation of Blair*, Wodr. Socy., 1848, 370.

[3] Baillie, *op. cit.*, III. 459, 468, 485; Row, *op. cit.*, 390: he excepts Crawford-Lindsay.

of the Council clearly inclined to Episcopacy; and if those who favoured the upholding of Presbytery had put their case too strongly, they would have been suspected of a personal opposition to the other form of government. They may well have thought that it would be foolish thus to risk their political positions, for, by their retention of them, they might still be able to prevent harsh dealing by the opposing faction.

But Middleton and his supporters did not intend to be restricted in their actions by the moderate party. For more than a year, however, they took no measures to ruin it. The second session of the Scottish Parliament began on the 8th of May, 1662, and during the summer months it ratified the Act of the Privy Council by which Episcopacy had been re-established. An Act for the restoration of Patronage was passed, and it was ordered that the Declaration should be imposed on all office-holders. Having thus settled the Church problem, Middleton proceeded to pass the Act of Indemnity, which there was no longer any reason to delay. It was now that he resolved upon that policy which was intended to undo the rival party, but which, in reality, was the cause of his own fall. The Act of Indemnity had been limited in scope by the imposition of fines on a large number of persons, but another exception to its general application was now devised. Twelve men named by Parliament were to be permanently incapacitated from holding office. Charles was informed that this was the loyal desire of his Parliament, and Parliament was led to believe that this was the wish of the King. Voting was to be secret, so that members would be the more free to act. Twelve names were to be written on a billet by every member. After being examined, the billets were to be burnt, and the names of the twelve men were not to be made known. The King himself would first decide upon their fate. The members, however, were not really at liberty to place any twelve names on their billets. They were given to understand that Lauderdale, Crawford-Lindsay, and Moray, among others, were obnoxious to the King in their official capacity. These three names, therefore,

appeared on the final list. Lauderdale had learned about the devices of his enemies, and he had informed Charles about the whole matter before the arrival of Richmond and Tarbat in London. They had been sent to convey to the King the wishes of his Parliament, but discovered that their plot was already known. They returned north to Scotland with this disconcerting information; and Middleton, who had made a tour of the west country in the autumn of 1662, went south to London to defend himself. The Scottish Council met there on the 7th of February; Lauderdale made a vehement and able attack upon his adversary, and Middleton was not able to convince the King by his defence. In the month of May, therefore, Rothes became Commissioner and went north to act in that capacity during the third session of the Scottish Parliament.[1]

Lauderdale was not yet satisfied. Middleton was no longer Commissioner, but he was still Genera of the forces raised and to be raised, as well as Commander of Edinburgh Castle. Newburgh was Captain of the King's Guard, while Tarbat was a Privy Councillor, a Lord of Session, and a Lord of Exchequer.[2] Before the Secretary could be supreme in Scotland, all these places must be taken from them; and as a necessary preliminary he desired a Parliamentary examination into the Billeting affair. Charles consented to the inquiry, and Lauderdale went north to Edinburgh where it was to be made.[3] In his absence Sir Robert Moray acted as Deputy Secretary,[4] while Sir John Home of Renton was appointed a Lord of Session, Justice-Clerk, and Master of Requests in place of Moray.[5]

During the second half of 1663 both the Secretary and the Deputy had a difficult task to perform. Clarendon had not

[1] For an account of the Billeting Affair see: G. Mackenzie, *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scot.*, 67–113, 117–135; Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 260–67, 359–369; O. Airy, Article on Lauderdale in *Quarterly Review*, July, 1884; *Polit. Hist. of Eng.*, VIII. (Lodge), 36–42.

[2] Airy, *L.P.*, I. letter XCIX.

[3] The Scottish Parliament was to sit on June 18, 1663.

[4] *L.P.*, 23119, f. 31, June 5, 1668.

[5] *H.M.C. Reports*, V. 649, June 4, 1663; *Cal. Dom. S. P.* (1663–64), 179, June 23, 1663.

approved of "billeting," but he was far from desiring the overthrow of Middleton. The English Bishops and Albemarle shared his suspicions of Lauderdale's intentions with regard to Episcopacy in Scotland.[1] It is true that Clarendon's influence had received a serious check in the spring of 1663, but the foolish attack made upon him by Bristol in July reinstated him for a time in the royal favour.[2] There were rumours that Lauderdale was in sympathy with Bristol's proceedings[3] and that the Presbyterians in Scotland were waxing insolent through the hope of his predominance.[4] The Secretary must convince Charles that the royal prerogative both as to civil and ecclesiastical matters would not suffer by his victory over Middleton. He had to persuade both the English and the Scottish Episcopate that they had in him a zealous supporter, and he must gain the confidence of the Scottish Parliament. Moray, on the other hand, had to influence the mind of the King, which would be prejudiced by the counsels of Clarendon and those who shared his political views. To do so successfully he had to know how to humour Charles, when to press home his arguments, and when to desist from attempts at persuasion.

The success which attended their policy is the sufficient proof of their adroit handling of the situation. During the third session of Parliament (June 18–October 9, 1663), a series of Acts was passed under Lauderdale's direction which delighted the King, Sheldon, and the upholders of prerogative and Episcopacy generally.[5] The Lords of the Articles were to be chosen in future as they had been in 1633, and this made the Estates completely subject to the Crown. An army of 20,000 foot and 2,000 horse, armed and provided for 40 days, was offered to the King; and this force would serve in any part of England, Scotland, or Ireland, against the foes of the Crown, both foreign and domestic. The ecclesiastical statutes of the pre-

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 266, 360.
[2] *Polit. Hist. of Eng.*, VIII. (Lodge), 68; also T. H. Lister's *Clarendon*, II. Ch. IX. 198–228.
[3] Airy, *L.P.*, I. letters XCVI, XCVII; also *L.P.*, 23119, f. 93.
[4] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 360.
[5] Airy, *L.P.*, I. letter XCVII.

ceding session were confirmed, and all persons were bound under penalties to attend the parish church. Finally, there were passed the Act for a National Synod and the Act against Billeting and Excepting.[1]

It was to the Secretary that Charles gave credit for the auspicious session of 1663. But by the nature of the situation, Lauderdale depended partly on Moray for his success, just as Moray for his depended in measure on Lauderdale. Living in London, Sir Robert could obtain and forward to Edinburgh news of the King's real purposes which enabled the Secretary to contradict and outwit his opponents. Dumfries and others of the Middleton group, for example, had circulated among the members of Parliament false reports as to the relations between Charles and their party. They asserted that Middleton was once more in favour with the King, and that the order to proceed to an examination into Billeting was to be revoked. In this way they hoped to prevent members from telling the truth to those whom Parliament had commissioned to inquire into the affair. Moray was able to assure Lauderdale that the reports were wholly untrue.[2] Again, in his letters he seldom omitted to encourage Lauderdale, and the Secretary was engaged in work which required some such stimulus if it was to be carried to a satisfactory conclusion. It would be inspiriting to hear of the pleasure with which Charles read his communications and with which he received notice of the various Acts.[3] On the other hand, when he thought it necessary to do so, Sir Robert did not hesitate to give advice to the Secretary. Middleton had offended by a disregard of his instructions and by not keeping Charles in touch with his doings. Moray was determined that Lauderdale should not lose favour through either of these errors. He repeatedly impressed upon him the necessity of writing both personally and fully.[4] On the 4th of

[1] *A.P.S.*, VII. 455, 465, 471, 480.
[2] Airy, *L.P.*, I. letters LXXXIV, LXXXV.
[3] The letters of this type are too numerous to specify: see Airy, *L.P.*, I. letters XCVII, CIV, CV.
[4] Airy, *L.P.*, I. letter CIV. etc.

June the King had written to the Scottish Parliament a letter expressing his dislike of the "Billeting" practice, and he wished that it should be printed. The Secretary did not take steps to this end, and it was not until Sir Robert's demand had become importunate that he at last obeyed (August 7, 1663).[1] On various minor matters also he received good counsel.

This task of informing, inspiriting, and advising Lauderdale was not, however, the most important or the most difficult to which Moray had to address himself. He was responsible for the careful selection of Scottish news which was allowed to appear in the journal of the day. English opinion relative to Scottish affairs was largely determined by the nature of the information thus supplied, and the policy of Charles with regard to his northern kingdom was influenced partly by the attitude of leading persons in England.[2]

But it was the favour of the King himself which it was, above all, important to secure. Before the end of July the Committee appointed to inquire into the matter of Billeting had reported both to the Articles and to Parliament. The Middleton faction stood convicted of duplicity both to Charles and to Parliament. Thereupon, the Estates addressed a letter to the King, and this, along with one from himself (July 31, 1663), Lauderdale forwarded to London.[3] At the same time, Rothes sent to Moray a series of Instructions, which informed him what advice he was to offer to the King.[4]

Firstly, he was to advise the dismissal of Newburgh, Tarbat, and Middleton from their various offices. There were legal grounds for such action, and indeed the King could legally decree the death-penalty against "leasing-makers." The delinquents would not be able to complain of undue rigour in the application of the law. Middleton's post as General of all forces raised or to be raised was unprecedented in time of peace and wholly needless. As Commander of

[1] *L.P.*, 23119, ff. 61, 67, 80, 154.
[2] Airy, *L.P.*, I. letters LXXXI, CVII.
[3] Airy, *L.P.*, I. letter XCIX.
[4] *L.P.*, 23119, f. 128.

Edinburgh Castle he would have too much influence over the capital. Moreover, it was desirable to dismiss Middleton before the settling of a Militia.

Moray was then to point out that if Middleton was dismissed Charles would be more loyally served and more perfectly obeyed in the future than he had been in the past. The Middleton party had never been really powerful, and it was now hopelessly weakened. It had been artificially strengthened by promises of a share in the fines, but the great majority of the nobility was now alienated from it. Middleton had practically no interest in the nobility by blood or alliance. The country, therefore, would remain quiet, and it would even be actively helpful to Charles in any part of his dominions if the King required aid from his Scottish subjects. The Scottish Parliament would issue a Declaration to that effect if the King thought fit. Nor would the new Government neglect measures for the maintenance of Episcopacy; the western counties especially would receive attention. To prove the reality of these promises, the Parliament would offer to the King a Militia of adequate though moderate strength.

The country, in fact, was too impoverished to be able to maintain a large force. The existing military establishment was a national grievance. It consisted of two troops of horse (one of them commanded by Middleton, one called the Guards), and six companies of foot. Without the knowledge of either Rothes or Lauderdale, Charles had signed for these forces "an Establishment much greater than Scotland ever knew." Middleton for his own account had received a sum of £30,000 sterling. The Excise could not cope with such heavy impositions; and Charles was to be advised to disband the troops of horse which Middleton commanded, and to retain the six companies of foot only until the Militia had been organised. Another grievance was the long continuance and the expense of Parliament. It would be well to dissolve it speedily, and Scotland would return to the "good old form of Government by his Majesty's Privy Council." Until this was done, people would not believe that things had been

settled, and that they were secure from changes. Charles need not fear to act thus, for he could always be sure of a large majority in Parliament and in the Articles. Finally, Moray was to present to the King a commission for trying bribery, and in general he was to manage all the foregoing particulars with his "knowen discretion."[1]

From London Sir Robert replied to Rothes and Lauderdale on the 6th of August. He had gone to the King with the Instructions, Lauderdale's letter, and the Parliament's letter. But Charles was about to set out for Tunbridge, and wished to defer the discussion of such matters until his return. This was to have taken place on Saturday the 8th; but as Saturday passed without any appearance of the King, Moray left for Tunbridge on the 9th. He could not tell how long the Court might remain there, and he knew how anxious Lauderdale was to hear the royal decision.[2] But while Charles was at Tunbridge he had little energy for business, and he did not return to Whitehall until the 19th of August. It was the 20th, therefore, before Sir Robert obtained a full and adequate audience.[3]

Before submitting to the King the proposals of Rothes and Lauderdale, Sir Robert laid before him two drafts of a royal letter to the Scottish Parliament, with the composition of which he had occupied the leisure of the preceding fortnight. One was couched in a somewhat rhetorical strain, and it was rejected. With the other Charles expressed himself as pleased.[4] It enabled Lauderdale to proceed to the passing of an Act against Billeting. Next, Moray told the King that if he had already decided the fate of Middleton, his will would not be questioned; otherwise he begged leave to put certain considerations before him. If it was decided that the ex-Commissioner should be totally laid aside, there came the question as to how and when this was to be done. Charles was inclined to agree that the position of General held on the

[1] *L.P.*, 23119, f. 128.
[2] *Ibid.*, ff. 155, 161.
[3] *Ibid.*, f. 173.
[4] *Ibid.*

existing terms was not, from the monarch's point of view, a desirable one for a subject to occupy. But he was not so favourable to the project of dismissing his old servant from office without a hearing. He suggested that the matter might be settled at a meeting of the Scottish Council, a plan of which Moray was quick to point out the practical disadvantages. A compromise was ultimately effected by which Middleton was to obtain a hearing before such as the King chose to summon for the occasion. Nothing would be done before the arrival of Rothes and Lauderdale in London. This decision, which was to apply to Newburgh also, was less favourable than the Secretary could have wished, but his deputy wrote assuringly. He was convinced that the late Commissioner would be expelled from office, and that the hearing was merely granted to soften the blow.

Charles' decision naturally raised the question as to the settlement of a Militia. Lauderdale and his friends desired that this should be carried through after the dismissal of Middleton. But if the Scottish Parliament was to be dissolved before that event took place, then no Act for a Militia would be passed for some time to come. Sir Robert, however, was fertile in expedients, and suggested to the King that Middleton should not be allowed to go to Scotland prior to the settlement of the question of his own future. In this way there would be no danger in proceeding to make and fulfil the offer of a Militia.

With respect to the grievances which had been specified in the Instructions, Charles was more amenable to persuasion. After a little hesitation, he consented to the dissolution of Parliament at the earliest possible date, and he agreed that Middleton's troop should be disbanded. But it was not until the 10th of September that he commanded a warrant to be issued to Middleton to deliver the Establishment.[1]

The Commission for Bribery had also to be presented to the King; and although this matter is unimportant in itself, it illustrates the discretion and care with which Moray pro-

[1] Airy, *L.P.*, I. letter CVII.

ceeded.[1] In the draft of the commission Lauderdale had interlined the name of a certain individual as a desirable commissioner. Sir Robert was surprised: the person in question was one against whom much could be advanced, and Lauderdale had said nothing to induce Charles to agree to the nomination. The Deputy felt that this might prejudice Lauderdale with the King, and he proposed to act, and seemingly did act, in the following manner. A commission was drawn, verbally identical with the draft, but a blank was left for the names. Charles would ask for suggestions as to nominees, and Sir Robert proposed to mention those whom Lauderdale had inserted in his list, laying stress on the matter or not as he would find advisable. His anticipations were realised, and, owing to his manner of conducting the affair, nothing untoward happened.[2]

In subsequent letters Moray counselled Lauderdale and Rothes to journey south as soon as possible.[3] Middleton's friends would utilise the time of delay. But the Scottish Parliament found work to occupy it until the 9th of October.[4] Then it was dissolved, and Rothes, Lauderdale, Bellenden, Montrose, Dumfries and Fletcher set out for London.[5] On their arrival Rothes gave an account of transactions in Scotland. Middleton's fate was not immediately settled. But before the end of the year he was allowed to speak in his own defence, and he did so somewhat feebly. On the 5th of January following, therefore, he resigned his two military offices, and Lauderdale's triumph was complete.[6]

[1] *L.P.*, 23119, ff. 157, 173.
[2] *Ibid.*, f. 173.
[3] *Ibid.*, 23119, f. 182; 23120, ff. 5, 19, 55–56.
[4] *A.P.S.*, VII. 503.
[5] J. Nicoll's *Diary*, Ban. Club, 1836, 402.
[6] *L.P.*, 23120, ff. 140 *et seq.*; 23121, f. 2.

CHAPTER VII

1663–1673

SCOTTISH POLITICS

THE victory of Lauderdale over Middleton did not bring the Presbyterian party any immediate relief. In 1663 Rothes had been appointed Commissioner to the Scottish Parliament,[1] and he remained Commissioner until 1667. From 1664 until 1667 he was also Treasurer, General of the forces in Scotland, and a Commander of Life Guards.[2] Along with Sharp and Alexander Burnet he adopted against the Presbyterians harsh measures of doubtful legality.[3] These were carried out first by means of a commission court specially appointed to relieve the Privy Council of excess of work,[4] and, after its abolition, by Sir James Turner and his troops.

Lauderdale personally was hostile to this policy, but it was difficult for him to oppose it. Living as he did in London, he could not say that his knowledge of the situation in Scotland was so ample as that of the triumvirate. Moreover, the ecclesiastical policy in Scotland was necessarily similar to that which was being pursued in England, and the influence of Clarendon and the Anglican party was still dominant at Court. On the other hand, while he was not willing to increase the suspicion with which he was regarded by the Anglicans, he did not wish to estrange from himself the sympathies of the Presbyterians in Scotland. Therefore he abstained from active co-operation with Rothes and Sharp;

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 364.
[2] J. Nicoll, *Diary*, Ban. Club, 1836, 421.
[3] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 375, 377–8.
[4] *Ibid.*, I. 369–70; *Polit. Hist. of Eng.* VIII. (Lodge), 186.

he felt certain that eventually they would have to be put aside.[1]

In spite of the fact that he did not hinder Sharp and Rothes, Lauderdale was regarded with suspicion by the two Scottish Archbishops.[2] Lauderdale, however, did not stand alone in his dislike of their policy; and his party, both in England and in Scotland, incurred the hostility with which he himself was regarded.

"Your Grace seeth" Alexander Burnet wrote to Sheldon, "that by Lauderdale and Sir Robert Moray and their emissaries all Scots affairs are managed here: and their correspondents in Scotland are Argyle, Tweeddale, Kincardine, Crawford, etc., and if they can draw in my Lord Commissioner by this match between the Earl of Loudoun and his niece, I am confident not a person in Scotland will have the confidence to contradict or oppose them."[3]

It is impossible to estimate accurately the extent to which Moray occupied himself with politics from 1664 to 1667. From a letter which he wrote to Sheldon in the autumn of the latter year, it would appear as if he had been taking very little part in such affairs. "You will easily believe it looks odd to me to see myself launched forth into a sea of business, after lying many years unrigged and moored out of the reach of active employments."[4] This seems to imply at least that he had not held any official post during the period. But Argyle wrote to him from time to time about the situation in Scotland,[5] and Alexander Burnet's remarks, although they may be exaggerated, cannot be wholly unfounded. The very fact that Moray was chosen to do important work in Scotland in 1667 indicates that he was well aware of the course which matters had taken since 1663, and that he had not been a stranger to the council-room.

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 370.

[2] *Ibid.*, I. 380–1; Airy, *L.P.*, II. App. p. v. May 2, 1664.

[3] Airy, *L.P.*, II. App. p. xxvii. Salisbury, Sept. 4, 1665.

[4] *Sheldon MSS.* (Dolben Papers), Bodl. MSS. Add. C. 302, f. 79.

[5] *L.P.*, 23122, f. 140; 23123, f. 38, f. 143; 23125, f. 22, f. 99, f. 177. Lothian also wrote to him in connection with the fines. *Corr. of the Earls of Ancrum and Lothian*, Ban. Club, 1875, II. 474–6 (April 4, 1666).

His return to a more conspicuous political position was due to various causes. When the Dutch war began, Charles was anxious that there should be no disturbance in Scotland. To ensure this, a force of 3,000 foot and 8 troops of horse was raised; the first and second commands were given respectively to Dalziel and Drummond, both of whom had fought at Worcester and since then in Russia. Sharp and Burnet were delighted, and the various officers hoped to enrich themselves at the expense of the Presbyterians. In spite of this increase in the forces and of Rothes' assertions that there would be no rebellion in Scotland, the Pentland Rising took place (Nov., 1666). The King was greatly annoyed by this event,[1] and about the same time he became more fully instructed as to the duplicity of Sharp. The cruelty displayed by the Episcopal clergy and by the military party in the punishment of the Pentland rebels did not tend to reinstate either Sharp or Rothes in the royal favour. At this juncture, also, the King was alienated from Clarendon, so that the clergy and the officers in Scotland could not rely upon the Church party in England.[2]

Moderate men like Tweeddale and Kincardine took advantage of these circumstances. They proceeded to Court, "and laid before the King the ill state the country was in. Sir Robert Moray talked often with him about it." The early months of 1667 were marked by events which were significant of approaching changes. Sharp was ordered not to attend the Convention of Estates which met in January, 1667, and Charles refused to follow the counsels of the violent party, represented in London by Drummond. The Council was not to be allowed to tender the Declaration to any one whom it suspected, and to treat as traitors those who refused to sign it. Instead of permitting this, the King wrote to the Privy Council on the 12th of March recommending a more reasonable procedure.[3]

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 419, 423.

[2] Wodrow, I. Bk. II. Ch. II. 271–2.

[3] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 427, 429; Wodrow, I. Bk. II., Ch. II. 272–3.

In April it was decided that Rothes should be "stripped of all his places," but he was not to be deprived of them all at once. At first he would be ordered to vacate his position as Treasurer, and as an apparent compensation he would be appointed Lord Chancellor. As the holder of the latter office he could do little harm. The Treasury would be put into Commission; Moray, Tweeddale, Kincardine, and Bellenden would form a majority of the Commissioners. A milder policy would be inaugurated by Sir Robert and Tweeddale, although its exact nature would depend upon circumstances in Scotland. In order that the King might obtain reliable information Moray was to go north in the course of the summer. Lauderdale, the leader of the new administration, was to remain at Court. These arrangements were made so secretly that "neither the Lord Rothes nor the two Archbishops had the least hint of it." [1]

By the middle of June Sir Robert had reached Edinburgh, and his first task was to announce to Rothes his appointment as Chancellor. Rothes was by no means anxious to obtain this honour, and said that he was incapable of performing the duties of the position. Moray had great difficulty in persuading him to accept it. The King wished to relieve Rothes of the heavy duties which the Treasurership involved. He had not informed him of this intention because he had so much confidence in him. He knew that Rothes would willingly do whatever was desired of him, and felt that he was the fittest man for the Chancellorship. A refusal would disappoint the King, and could be merely temporary. On the 4th of July Rothes wrote to Lauderdale, stating that he had accepted the new post, though with a "sad hert." [2]

A fortnight before this Moray had taken his seat in the Privy Council, and had announced the royal pleasure as to

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 431, 439; *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1665–69), 294; Wodrow, I. Bk. II., Ch. II. 274; Row, *Continuation of Blair*, Wodrow Socy., 1848, 510; Airy, Art. on Lauderdale in *Quarterly Review*, July, 1884.

[2] *L.P.*, 23127, ff. 34, 38–41, 50; Airy, *L.P.*, II. 1–6.

the Treasury and the Chancellorship.[1] At last the military party and the Episcopal clergy were aware that their policy of violence was to give place to a milder regime. It was clear that Rothes would soon cease to be Commissioner and that the army would be disbanded on the conclusion of peace with Holland. The military party, headed by Rothes and Hamilton, was hostile to both these proposals, and it was not to be anticipated that it would acquiesce in them without a struggle.[2]

Success in the struggle would depend in part upon the attitude of the Episcopalian clergy. Moray and Tweeddale were determined that the alliance between the officers and the clergy should now terminate. Fortunately, the Archbishop of St. Andrews had resolved to court the group of men to whom the King had entrusted the government of Scotland. "As for the Primate," wrote Sir Robert on the 1st of July, "near friends of his whom you trust tell me he will acquiesce in what is done, and says he will never more be for Commissioners nor armies." Finding Sharp thus disposed, Moray and Tweeddale resolved to "keep very fair with him," and the former recommended Lauderdale to show him favour also.[3] They must all three be at one in their apparent friendliness to him. The result was that the clergy as a whole dissociated themselves from the military party, at least in so far as open support was concerned. Archbishop Burnet, however, remained hostile to the new administration, and wrote to Sheldon from time to time in denunciation of its doings.[4]

[1] In the Index to the *R.P.C. of Scot.*, V. (1665–1669), Sir Robert Moray is called Sir R. Moray of Priestfield. This, however, is a mistake. Priestfield was the property of Sir R. Murray of Cameron, the Provost of Edinburgh. (See *Reg. of the Great Seal of Scotland*, under dates July 13, 1663, July 8, 1661.) Murray is also mentioned as the owner of Priestfield in the *Transactions of the Socy. of Antiquaries of Scot.*, March, 1859. It is, therefore, *his* attendances, which are recorded in the *R.P.C. of Scot.*, 1669–72. Sir Robert Moray was not in Scotland during these years.

[2] Airy, *L.P.*, II. 12, 13.

[3] *Ibid.*, II. 13, 31.

[4] Airy, *L.P.*, II. App. pp. xlv-lxiv. During Nov. and Dec., 1667, Moray suggested that the King should permanently "secure" Sharp by writing to him in praise of the part he had played. This was done. *Cf.* Airy, *L.P.*, II. 84–7, 90–3.

The military party was thus weakened, but it was not yet defeated. Its task was twofold—to prevent the disbandment of the army and the overthrow of the Commissioner. Their plan was to suggest that, if the army was disbanded, there would be an insurrection in the west country, and that the Episcopal Church would be in danger of destruction. In order to counteract the impression which such rumours might make upon the King, Sir Robert wrote to Lauderdale in a reassuring strain. He must not listen to idle talk about "mad phanaticks." The Pentland Rising had not been a "formed design," and it ought to have been more easily crushed than it was. Moray was conferring with friends as to the number of troops that should be kept up.[1] On the 23rd of August, the Council received the King's letter ordering the disbandment. Two troops of Guards, commanded by Rothes and Newburgh, and some of the foot-soldiers, were retained.[2] Neither Moray nor Tweeddale thought it wise to advocate a complete disbandment.[3]

But Rothes and those dependent on him did not despair. Hamilton and he both hoped that "the personal credit the Commissioner hath at Court, and arguments he can use at meeting there with the King and Earl Lauderdale, will prevail to keep power where it is now lodged, and then they are still on the foremost horse; or if they be outed of that now, as to some degrees, yet there will enough remain to enable them to discompose all that is done contrary to their interests and desires, so much evidence as they shall be thrown out with disgrace as authors of mad courses, and then they themselves must needs remonter leur beste, and come in play again, without fear of further disturbance or competitors." [4]

Tweeddale and Moray appreciated the danger of a meeting between the Commissioner and the King, and both agreed that Rothes must lay down his Commissionership as soon as

[1] Airy, *L.P.*, II. 13–15, 21.
[2] *R.P.C. of Scot.* V. (1665–69), 334.
[3] Airy, *L.P.*, II. 37, 41, 21; also *L.P.*, 23127, f. 203. Tweeddale to Lauderdale.
[4] Airy, *L.P.*, II. 36. Moray to Lauderdale.

possible, and at least before he was allowed to go to London. Sir Robert's arguments were especially cogent. Rothes could be very attractive and persuasive, while Charles found it hard to say "bleak things." "Sure it must be easier for his Majesty to write a letter to him for that effect than to speak it." If Charles did not write, then the unpleasant task of verbally telling Rothes would devolve upon Lauderdale. Meantime, the Commissioner was talking as if he would persuade the King in London to return to the former policy, and this would make it more difficult for Tweeddale and Moray to secure the acceptance by the Council of their plans for the future. It was not desirable to keep the country in prolonged suspense as to which policy was ultimately to prevail. Until Rothes was ordered to give up his Commissionership, little information would be obtained as to the corruption that had been rife and the cruelties that had been practised. Finally, since the Commissioner as such disposed of the forces, Rothes' retention of the office during the period of disbandment might be dangerous. If this advice was not taken, Tweeddale would follow Rothes to London in order to lessen the effect of his arguments.[1] In the end Tweeddale and Moray gained their point, and Rothes resigned his office on the 8th of October, ten days before proceeding to Court. Tweeddale left for London shortly before him. Sir Robert had also advised that he should be deprived of his position as General. This had virtually been done by the 17th of October, but a formal order to resign was not issued until the last day of the year.[2]

Thus, by the middle of October, the clerical party had been won over and the military party had been subdued. Moray and Tweeddale had meantime begun to introduce a more moderate policy than that of their predecessors. Sir Robert was doubtful whether Lauderdale and the King would approve of the very considerable changes which he intended to effect.

[1] Airy, *L.P.*, 20, 47–9, 65–6.

[2] *L.P.*, 23128, f. 103; Airy, *L.P.*, II. 20, 76, 78; *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1665–69), 390.

Lauderdale's enemies might accuse him of disloyalty to the existing ecclesiastical establishment, but Moray assured him that he ought not to concern himself with what they would say. By his discreet conduct between 1661 and 1667, he had proved to the King that he was no foe to Episcopacy, whereas his enemies had demonstrated the folly of undue severity. " I do assure you," he wrote, " and you may say so to the King, that what we do propose is the sure way to settle and secure Episcopacy, which the courses hitherto taken have been so far from establishing that they had almost unhinged the State." [1]

On the 12th of March, the King had issued instructions for the prevention of rebellion at home and invasion from abroad. The Privy Council was empowered to tender the oath of allegiance and the Declaration to " such active and leading persons of the disaffected party as you shall find just reason to suspect, and to secure the persons of all who shall refuse either the one or the other, when so tendered unto them." It was to require " all, both gentlemen, heritors, and commons within these shires where there appears most disaffection, to bring in by such a day to be named by you all arms and all powder," and to " seize all serviceable horses in the possession of any disaffected or suspected person of what quality soever."

A Militia of horse and foot was to be modelled ; and, lastly, " for exemplary punishment of the late rebels, for the terrifying of all men from daring to attempt anything of the like nature hereafter upon any pretext whatsoever, and for the more effectual rooting out of rebellious principles, we do peremptorily require you without any further delay to give present order for the criminal pursuit of all heritors or men of estates, all preachers, and all military officers who were in the late rebellion or who assembled themselves without our authority in order to the rebellion, before the Justice-General, to the end they may be tried according to law, and, being found guilty, forfeited without any further delay." [2]

[1] Airy, *L.P.*, II. 69–70, 49–50.

[2] *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1665–69), 267–268.

On the 2nd of September, 1667, Sir Robert Moray in a letter to Lauderdale mentioned that, with the King's permission, he would bring before the Council certain "proposals," which, in his opinion, were better calculated than the above instructions to prevent rebellion for the future. A proclamation should be issued announcing a general pardon and indemnity to all that were in the late rebellion. Certain people, however, were to be excepted from this pardon: namely, all who had been forfeited, those who were under process of forfeiture, and those who, since the rebellion, had done violence to the persons of clergymen or deprived them of their goods. Those to whom the pardon extended must before a certain date give bond and sufficient security for the peace. A Militia should be settled "in that way that His Majesty shall be pleased to appoint." Noblemen, gentlemen, heritors, and feuars, who entered in bond for themselves or their tenants and servants to keep the peace, ought not to be pressed to take the Declaration. Finally, those who had taken the oath of allegiance and the Declaration, or who had fought for the royal authority against the rebels, were to be exempted from the operation of the instructions of the previous March with regard to the bringing in of horses and arms.[1]

Moray was particularly anxious that the last two "proposals" should be carried into effect.

"As to the forbearing to press the Declaration on those that give security," he wrote on the 19th of September, "I take it to be a greater and more important test than the taking of the Declaration was, by very much. For it states the distinguishing of people on the right foundation, that is keeping the peace (or loyalty, as it is contradistinct from ecclesiastical considerations), which, if it once be well-secured, other things are built upon it naturally, and so law, religion, etc., have their force and support as well as the King's authority and crown, with which they stand and fall as being inseparably conjoined. Therefore, this being first provided for, the rest follow in their place and course, so that the engaging for keeping the peace should by all means be en-

[1] Airy, *L.P.*, II. 41, 52–3.

couraged by allowing those that do it all the privileges of other good subjects, as arms and the like, seeing they themselves become law-biding and contribute to the security of the Kingdom." "How should they else concur upon occasion for suppressing of insurrections?"[1]

These "proposals" were not wholly novel. In January, 1667, Argyle had suggested that a bond to keep the peace would be as effectual as the imposition of the Declaration.[2] Moreover, Sir Robert discussed them carefully with Tweeddale before submitting them to the Council. Nevertheless, he played the chief part both in drawing them up and in securing their adoption, so that, with but slight qualifications, they may fairly be called Moray's "proposals." On the 13th of September they were hotly discussed in Council, and, after the clerk had vainly attempted to prevent their passing, they were agreed to by a small majority and forwarded to the King for his approval. The King's reply, received on the 8th of October, was favourable on the whole; but many persons were exempted from the general pardon, and those who were not had to give bond and security for the peace before the 1st of January, 1668.[3]

It remained to be seen what the Covenanters would think of the "proposals," and how many of them would sign the bond. According to Wodrow, they disliked the terms of the bond, and there was great discussion among them as to the exact implications of the promise "to keep the public peace." Was it equivalent to "homologating" the existing system in Church and State? Did the person who subscribed the bond thereby engage "to do nothing which may disturb or alter the present laws to which the public peace plainly

[1] Airy, *L.P.*, II. 63–4. It is clear that in this letter of Sept. 19, Sir Robert desiderated even more liberal proposals than those which were sent by the Council to the King: in order to carry arms, it was not to be necessary even to take the Declaration.

[2] *Letters of Argyle to Lauderdale*, Ban. Club, 1829, under dates Jan. 28, 30, 31, 1667.

[3] Airy, *L.P.*, II. 58, 52–3; Wodrow, I. Bk. II., Ch. II. 276; *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1665–69), 343–6.

refers?" Wodrow is very vague with regard to the number of those who accepted the pardon. "People did divide in their judgments and practices, as frequently happens in dubious and debatable cases. Some took it and others refused it." [1] According to Burnet, "the far greater number submitted to this. Those who were disturbed with scruples were a few melancholy inconsiderable persons." [2] This also is too general a statement. In the middle of November, 1667, Moray, writing to Harley, remarked: "The bonds have been signed very cheerfully and unanimously." [3] But on the 27th of December, in a letter to Lauderdale, he wrote: "I send you a pretty homily against bonds. . . . It shows the violent antipathy between signers and non-signers, so that the measure has at least broken the party." [4] This was, no doubt, success of a kind; but it was not the avowed object of the plan, and the party as a whole was not yet reconciled to the government. This is made perfectly clear by a letter from the Privy Council to the King, written on the 27th of February, 1668, from which it appears that "the whole number of those who have come in upon His Majesty's gracious pardon is 218, and of those who have not embraced the same as yet 300, who for the most part are very mean persons, as servants, subtenants, and craftsmen." On the other hand, Moray and Tweeddale could congratulate themselves on the fact that "few or none of the considerable heritors . . . have not signed the bond for the peace." [5] Even Wodrow grudgingly admits that "this pardon, such as it was, tended to the quiet of the country, and joined with the disbanding of the army, which was by far the most merciful and gracious act, gave a little breathing to the Presbyterians in the west and south." [6]

The best proof of the mildness of the government was

[1] Wodrow, I. Bk. II., Ch. II. 278–279.
[2] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 434.
[3] *H.M.C. Reports* (XIV), *Portland MSS.* III. App. II. 305.
[4] *L.P.*, 23128, f. 233. *Cf.* Wodrow.
[5] *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1665–9), 412–3.
[6] Wodrow, I. Bk. II., Ch. II. 277–8.

that conventicles began to be held more boldly. But the King was resolved that Episcopacy should remain the ecclesiastical system for Scotland, and in his letter to the Council of the 31st of December, 1667, he ordered that conventicles should be suppressed. To show the Presbyterians that the government, though moderate, was not weak, Moray advised on the 17th of December that Charles should write to the Primate a letter "to be communicate to the rest of the Bishops, . . . assuring them of his own intentions to support and countenance their order." This would be an effective reply to "phanatick rumours" that Episcopacy was to be overthrown. He inveighed against "a damned book . . . from beyond sea, called *Naphtali, or the Wrestlings of the Church of Scotland*," which he resolved to have burned by the hangman. "It hath all the Traitors' speeches on the scaffold here, and in a word all that a tongue set on fire by hell can say of things and persons hereaway." [1] He thought that the effect of its circulation would prove harmful, and from his point of view he was undoubtedly right; for even Row says of the book that although "there are many things well said and worthy of remark, there are some other things had need to be read *cum grano salis*." [2]

Nevertheless, conventicles continued to be held,[3] and it was felt that the Militia ought to be organised as quickly as possible in order to suppress them. The formation of a Militia had been one of Sir Robert's "proposals," and indeed as early as 1663 the Scottish Estates had offered to provide Charles with a force of 20,000 foot and 2,000 horse.[4] In the early autumn of 1667 Moray and Tweeddale had "not much urged the Militia business since the disbandment, for things have been quiet." "But now," they wrote, "we send a rough draft of a letter the King may send to the Council. It may be altered at pleasure." [5] (Oct. 5.) Nothing of any importance

[1] Airy, *L.P.*, II. 88–90.
[2] Row, *Continuation of Blair*, Wodrow Socy., 1848, 517.
[3] *L.P.*, 23129, f. 92, May 7, 1668; ff. 102, 112, 114.
[4] *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1665–69), Introd. xiv.
[5] *L.P.*, 23128, f. 101.

was effected during the winter, and it was not until the 6th of May following that the matter was seriously considered. On that day the Council received from the King an order for the organisation of a Militia upon specified lines in certain counties. The King's letter was followed by a " memorial for instructions to be given by the Privy Council to the Commissioners of the Militia in the several shires." Thereupon the Council recommended " the Earls of Linlithgow, Tweeddale and Kincardine, Lieutenant-General Drummond, Register, and Sir Robert Moray to meet and consider the King's letter and memorial for instructions, and to prepare and draw up commissions and instructions conform thereto." The work of carrying out the plan which this commitee submitted to the Council on the 8th of May proved to be both difficult and tedious ; but as Sir Robert left Scotland for London about the middle of June, he cannot have had much to do with it.[1]

Moray and Tweeddale did not devote their attention solely to measures which had in view the reconciling of the Presbyterians and the prevention of rebellion. The corruption of the administration under Rothes had been disgraceful, and had created a dangerous discontent among many who were not hostile to Episcopacy. It was necessary to satisfy this element of the population, and Tweeddale and Sir Robert set themselves to the task.

" The government of Scotland " writes Burnet, " had now another face. All payments were regularly made ; there was an overplus of £10,000 of the revenue saved every year ; and there were several projects set on foot for the encouragement of trade and manufacture. Lord Tweeddale and Sir Robert Moray were so entirely united, that, as they never disagreed, so all plied before them. . . . No vice was in reputation ; justice was impartially administered." [2]

[1] *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1665–9), 438–442, 446–451 ; Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 503.

[2] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 439–40. *Cf.* Bellenden's praise of Moray's exactitude in everything. *L.P.*, 23127, f. 107 ; 23128, f. 207.

A conspicuous example of their reforming zeal was their success in depriving Sir Walter Seaton of his position as farmer of the Customs.

"The club who have taken the Customs," wrote Moray to Lauderdale, "we encouraged to vie with Sir W. Seaton for these reasons: to get rid of a servant who cannot be supposed to be honest when he has so grossly corrupted others; he having had a bargain himself allows the merchants . . . that, that with continuance would render the Customs of much less value than they really are; the continuing of the Customs in his hands kept us from ever getting to know their real worth—now we shall have access to all." [1]

At the bidding for the Customs, £31,300 was accepted; Seaton would not offer more than £31,000, which would have been an increase of £12,300 from the point of view of the government. "One would think by this Sir Walter had not a very bad pennyworth formerly." [2] Those who had ousted Seaton "are men anxious to serve the King. They propose to themselves little gain, and none that we shall not know. We are to do them all lawful favours, and will endeavour they shall not be losers." [3]

It was not enough, however, to introduce a purer and more moderate administration of public affairs; it was also necessary to inquire into and punish offences committed by the military and clerical parties during the period of their domination. Amongst the military men who had distinguished themselves by their oppressions in the south-west was Sir James Turner. His tyrannical acts had been an important cause of the Pentland Rising, and it was resolved to strike at him first. On the 26th of November the Privy Council received a royal letter ordering an examination. A committee of nine—among them Sir Robert—was appointed to "set down such orders for the trial of the said Sir James . . . as they shall find necessary and to draw up such a report as

[1] [3] *L.P.*, 23128, f. 125; Moray to Lauderdale, Sept. 11, 1667.

[2] Airy, *L.P.*, II. 73. See *post*, p. 139, *n.* 5.

may be sent to the King from the Council." As a result of a Commission of Inquiry into Turner's conduct in Dumfries and Kirkcudbright, the committee of nine drew up "a paper containing some grievances . . . from Kirkcudbright only (those in the other counties not being so full and clear)." Early in February Turner was called on to answer the complaints; on the 17th his reply was ready, and "the Committee having read and considered all . . . agreed to offer to the Council their humble opinion that the Council do . . . transmit to the Secretary the following report to be communicated to his Majesty." [1] Turner had been asked to show his commission and instructions, for it was hoped that these would reveal the injustice of Rothes and Archbishop Burnet. He had replied that he could not do this as he no longer possessed his vouchers. The rebels had taken them from him when they seized him in the autumn of 1666. Before his trial was over they did come into his hands, but he kept silent about them, for "the showing them might wrong my Lord Chancellor, and do me no good." [2]

On the 10th of March, an order was received from the King that he should be deprived of his command and called "to account for moneys owing." His accounts were heard by a Committee appointed for that purpose.[3] Turner had resolved "to vindicate his Majesty's justice by taking some guilt" upon himself. But a motive of prudence was conjoined with this consideration of loyalty. "I had reason to imagine, if I should plead not guilty I might be used severely enough." He charged himself, therefore, with £30,000 (Scots), and "on the 6th of May, the Committee made their report, and both my charge and discharge were allowed by their Lordships." Turner admits that during his trial he was treated as a gentleman; and for the favourable nature of the concluding report, he expresses his special obligations

[1] *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1665–69), 368–70, 407–8.

[2] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 440; Turner's *Memoirs*, Ban. Club, 1829, 205.

[3] *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1665–69), 426–7, 442–4.

to Moray and Tweeddale.[1] Hence it is not surprising that " the people of the country cried out against those censures. It was said that when by such violent proceedings men had been inflamed to a rebellion, upon which so much blood was shed, all the reparation given was that an officer or two were broken ; and a great man was taken down a little upon it, without making any public examples for the deterring others." [2] Doubtless the Council felt that it would be unfair to punish too harshly one who had probably kept within his instructions, who had been merely the agent of the Commissioner, and who had at any rate been loyal to the Chancellor. Nevertheless, the new administration was not disposed to be very severe : such men as Dalziel and Drummond were not brought to account at all.[3]

Moray did not wish the clerical party to remain completely exempt from punishment any more than the military. According to Burnet, he went through the west of Scotland, and found the " greatest part " of the Episcopal clergy to be a scandalous and ignorant set of men. This tour must have been made in the early spring of 1668. On two occasions between August, 1667, and the end of that year, Sir Robert had spent a short time at Hamilton.[4] But these visits would not suffice for more than a superficial examination. After January, 1668, he was seldom present in Council, and his letters to Lauderdale cease about the same time.[5] It may be assumed, therefore, that he was going round the west country in a more systematic way.

In any case, he resolved that a great number of the Episcopal clergy of the west must be dismissed and replaced by

[1] Turner, *op. cit.*, 218, 225.

[2] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 441.

[3] Ballantyne was tried, and ordered to leave the country ; but this sentence was passed after Moray left Scotland.

[4] Letters from Hamilton : Aug. 20, 29 ; Sept. 2, 23 ; Dec. 27, 1667.

[5] See Index to *R.P.C. of Scot.* (1665–69), 785, for attendances.

better men. But it would be difficult to effect such expulsions: Archbishop Burnet had placed these men and felt bound to protect them; the ministers would not give information against each other; and the people, although they detested them, would not accuse them before such an unlawful ecclesiastical authority as a bishop. Sir Robert proposed, therefore, that "a court should be constituted by a special permission from the King, made up of some of the laity as well as the clergy, to try the truth of these scandalous reports that went upon the clergy." Sheldon approved of this and Sharp did not oppose it. Nevertheless, Archbishop Burnet and the ministers were so hostile to the proposal that it had to be abandoned.[1] That it was neither unjust nor unnecessary[2] is proved by the fact that Leighton, two years after this, found himself compelled to purge the clergy of the Glasgow diocese.[3] This is very significant, because, in the intervening period, many of them had left for Ireland, despairing of protection from the government.[4] The worst and most hated among them no doubt found this course advisable.[5]

Moray had never been certain how long he was to remain in Scotland.[6] Since the beginning of 1668 Tweeddale and he had known that he might soon have to journey to London,[7] but it was not until the 4th of June that Lauderdale was

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 441–2; Row, *Continuation of Blair*, 517.

[2] Salmon in his *Examination*, I. 590–4 (Lond. 1724), asserts that it was both.

[3] D. Butler, *Leighton*, 437.

[4] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 442.

[5] In connection with the punishment of offenders, it may be noted that Sir Walter Seaton was examined by a Committee of Exchequer of which Moray was a member. A report on the defalcations was signed by Sir Robert on June 10, 1668 (*L.P.*, 35125, f. 181b), immediately before his journey to London. With the subsequent discussion as to the punishment to be inflicted on Seaton, he had (so far as is known) no concern. Tweeddale and he were accused by Bellenden and W. Sharp of unfairness to Seaton (*L.P.*, 23129, ff. 164, 233).

[6] *H.M.C. Reports* (1904), *MSS. of the Marquis of Bath*, I. 43. Moray to Sir Ed. Harley, June 21, Aug. 7, 1667.

[7] *L.P.*, 23128, f. 231. "S.S." [*i.e.* Tweeddale] "and I guess the Treaty may cost me a journey" [*i.e.*, the Treaty about the trade relations between England and Scotland]. Moray to Lauderdale, Dec. 25, 1667.

"commanded to write immediately" for him. The King thought it necessary that Lauderdale should go to Scotland, but "from Moray he expects full information in all that relates to Scotland, and then he will be better able to judge what commands to lay on me." [1]

In obedience to the royal command, Sir Robert left for London on the 16th of June. He was accompanied by his niece, Lady Sophia Lindsay, who was in ill health, and about whose condition he was greatly concerned.[2] Probably he was not sorry to leave Scotland. On two occasions he had protested to Lauderdale that he was not anxious to quit his native country, and that he would remain in the position which the King wished him to fill.[3] But it is clear from his letters to the Harleys that the lack of interest in scientific matters beyond the Border must have been irksome to him,[4] and Tweeddale was afraid that, if he were once allowed to go south, he would not return. [5]

Two days before his departure Sharp, writing to Sheldon, praised Moray's administration of the country.

"I think I may without any unbecoming insinuation say, that as by his carriage and way since his appearing for the king's service in this country, he hath got a deserved reputation and esteem generally, so he has not been wanting by discourses and example to improve that advantage, by taking all prudent occasions to bring vice and licentiousness into discountenance, and to recommend the practice of meekness, charity, sobriety, regard to authority and order, which have been qualities too much obsolete amongst us, and, if once brought into credit and fashion, would prove the most effectual cure to our evils." [6]

[1] *Tweeddale MSS.* (Yester House), Lauderdale Letters, f. 165. June 4, 1668. Partly, the King's desire seems to have been due to a proposal for a Parliamentary Union between the two countries. This appears from the letter of June 4, 1668. See also J. Bruce, *Report on the Union of England and Scotland* (1799), I. 214.

[2] *L.P.*, 23129, ff. 160, 110.

[3] *L.P.*, 23128, f. 89, Oct. 1, 1667; f. 231, Dec. 25, 1667.

[4] *H.M.C. Reports*, XIV., *Portland MSS.*, III. 305.

[5] *L.P.*, 23128, f. 336, Feb. 27, 1668. Tweeddale to Lauderdale.

[6] Airy, *L.P.*, II. App. p. lxii.

It is a pity that these words were not penned by a more genuine man than Sharp. Such as they are, they savour of exaggeration. Precisely owing to his moderation as a statesman Moray must have annoyed the extremists on both sides. Nevertheless, it is probable that even they felt a respect for him personally.

His arrival in London proved a source of great pleasure to the King. " His Majesty received M.R. with crushing and shaking his hand, and with as good looks and as much kindness as I could wish. The King heard his discourse, and seems well pleased with all of us." Charles concluded, however, that Lauderdale had better not go to Scotland, and Tweeddale was told of this decision immediately. The King had promised that, in that event, Sir Robert would be asked to return to Edinburgh, and it must have been disappointing for Tweeddale to find that his fears were to be realised, and that Moray was not coming.[1] From the middle of July until the beginning of November, he did not cease to urge upon Lauderdale his need of Sir Robert's help. The latter was too much concerned about the health of his niece and too much occupied in his chemical pursuits. Meantime there was more business to do than Tweeddale could undertake. " It is talked about that he is not to come," he wrote, " and we find the prejudice of it already. Everybody who wishes us well, displeased, and contrarywise . . . I protest M.R.'s stay will ruin all : it is a shame to suffer it." [2] Lauderdale and the King ought to insist upon his leaving London. Lauderdale professed his agreement with Tweeddale's opinion,[3] but he either could not or would not prevail upon Moray to go, and Charles did not like to put pressure on a favourite. By the 5th of November Tweeddale under-

[1] *Tw. MSS.*, ff. 175, 177, 165.
[2] *L.P.*, 23129, f. 243 ; 23130, f. 56.
[3] *Ibid.*, 23130, f. 76.

stood that he would have to do without the help of his former colleague. [1]

His importunity was doubtless a striking testimony to the importance of Sir Robert's achievement in Scotland, but that it was necessary seems to imply a certain selfishness on Moray's part. It would appear, however, that it was the health of his niece rather than his interest in science which retained him in London, although his enthusiasm for the new philosophy was not without influence.[2] But it is questionable whether the chief cause of his resolution is to be found in either of these facts. Perhaps, in spite of what Lauderdale said, he was not really anxious for Moray to return north, and it may be that Sir Robert no longer felt disposed to act for him in Scotland. According to Burnet, Lady Dysart, the daughter of W. Murray, obtained great influence over Lauderdale about this time, and during Moray's absence in Scotland she " made a breach " between the two men.

" She made Lord Lauderdale believe that Moray assumed the praise of all that was done to himself, and was not ill-pleased to pass as his governor. Lord Lauderdale's pride was soon fired with those ill impressions." [3]

That the relations between them were not as they had been is hinted also by words which Lauderdale used in a letter written to Tweeddale on the 16th of July, 1668. Moray, he says, has not been much with him. " What you have done with him in Scotland I know not, but truly he is much changed." [4]

Sir Robert's connection with Scottish politics, however, was not yet at an end. In June, 1669, Charles announced to a Scottish council in London that he would try to effect a Union of the Parliaments.[5] According to Burnet, Tweeddale

[1] *Tw. MSS.*, ff. 186, 209, 211 ; *L.P.*, 23130, f. 99.

[2] *Tw. MSS.*, ff. 179, 183, 190. Lauderdale to Tweeddale concerning Moray's preoccupation with his niece ; f. 211—with chemistry.

[3] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 439.

[4] *Tw. MSS.*, f. 181.

[5] G. Mackenzie, *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scot.*, 1821 edn., 137.

was the prime mover in the matter, and certainly he mentioned it as desirable in a letter of the 21st of September, 1667.[1] The King's resolve may have been due to the failure of the negotiations of the Trade Commissioners.[2] In Scotland it was not believed that either the King or his ministers were in earnest.[3] It was particularly difficult to suppose that Lauderdale could desire a successful issue to the negotiations. Nevertheless, Lauderdale was appointed Commissioner, and in this capacity he had to be present during the two sessions of Parliament held in Edinburgh, the first from the 19th of October to the 23rd of December, 1669, the second from the 22nd of July to the 22nd of August, 1670. On both these occasions, as in 1663, Moray acted as his deputy in London. "For though . . . he had used him very unworthily, yet he had that opinion of his virtue and candour that he left all his affairs to his care." [4]

The primary business of the Parliament was to empower the King to name Commissioners, and to grant to such as he should name a commission to treat for Union. By the 22nd of October, 1669, the Estates granted to Charles the power which he desired, but the commission was not given until the session of 1670.[5] In September of the latter year, the Union Commissioners met, and Sir Robert was chosen as one of the Scottish representatives.[6] He was present at the

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 505; *L.P.*, 23128, f. 56.

[2] J. Bruce, *Report on the Union*, I. 214.

[3] Mackenzie, *op. cit.*, 137–9.

[4] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 510.

[5] This was because the English Commons could not be induced to deal with the question of Union until 1670. They had quarrelled with the Lords, and insisted that the settlement of their dispute should precede the undertaking of all other business. Moray suggested to Lauderdale that, as the Scottish Parliament could not remain in session indefinitely, it might before adjourning grant a commission to treat concerning Union. But Lauderdale was unwilling to make the proposal to the Estates. People in Scotland were already sufficiently hostile to the idea of Union, and the advocate of such undue haste would make himself extremely unpopular. See *L.P.*, 23132, ff. 133, 143, 147, 150, 154, 158; *cf.* also Airy, *L.P.*, II., 149, 154, 155, 159, 163, 165.

[6] *Warrant Book, Scotland*, 1670–72 (P.R.O.), Aug. 15, 1670.

meetings which were held in Somerset House on various occasions from September to November.[1] Nothing came of the discussions, for Lauderdale insisted that all members of the Scottish Estates were to form part of the united Parliament. Sir George Mackenzie, therefore, had some grounds for his irritation at the handsome subsidies which the Estates granted to those who were to act as Commissioners for Scotland.[2]

So far as the question of Union was concerned, the Scottish Parliament need not have met; but during its two sessions it passed some important ecclesiastical legislation, including the Act of Supremacy in 1669 and Lauderdale's "Clanking Act" against conventicles in 1670. The original circumstance which led to the passing of the former was the first Indulgence of the 7th of June, 1669. The Scottish Council had been empowered to restore to their parishes, if these were vacant, such of the evicted ministers as had lived "peaceably and orderly." About forty of the leading Presbyterians accepted it. Archbishop Burnet and the synod of his diocese were incensed at what they considered an undesirable and illegal exercise of power by the State. In October, therefore, they drew up a condemnation of the Indulgence. A copy reached London after Lauderdale's departure for Scotland. Moray was greatly exasperated by it, and called it "a new unchristened Remonstrance," looking "like the spirit of rebellion." "I incline to think the Archbishop and his whole Synod, at least all that command in it, ought to be deposed and banished, if not worse. . . . Episcopal government . . . must be much better managed to be a support to monarchy or a pillar of religion." He spoke of it to the King in no measured terms, but "let myself go, as the strain of the damned paper led me. I have not spared it at all."[3]

Charles resolved that a repetition of the offence must be

[1] C. S. Terry, *The Cromwellian Union*, Scot. Hist. Socy., 1902, App.

[2] G. Mackenzie, *op. cit.*, 212.

[3] *L.P.*, 23132, *f.* 111, Oct. 6, 1669. *Cf.* Airy, *L.P.*, II. 137–8.

prevented, and that the chief offender must be punished. To effect the former purpose, the Act of Supremacy was passed on the 16th of November, 1669, and thereafter it was easier to bring about Burnet's downfall. The Act declared that the King was supreme "over all persons and in all causes ecclesiastical," and that "the ordering and disposing of the external government of the Church doth properly belong to his Majesty and his successors, as an inherent right to the Crown." Lauderdale was afraid that the Anglican clergy would make "assaults" upon a bill which gave the Crown such vast powers, and that Sheldon would be warned to oppose it. Moray, who thought the Act "the best thing the Scottish Church has ever seen," was to be particularly on his guard against any such move.[1]

The Clanking Act of 1670 was one of unexampled severity. Lauderdale had hitherto counselled moderation, but his character was changing for the worse under the influence of Lady Dysart. Other circumstances, however, help to explain his policy. There had recently been an armed conventicle in Fife, and such meetings might become dangerous.[2] Many were convinced that the Act was not to be enforced, but that it was intended to show the Covenanters what would happen if they rejected the scheme of "Accommodation" which Leighton was attempting to get accepted. Perhaps it was on this ground that Moray approved of the Act. Leighton, on the other hand, was hostile to it, and it is difficult to see how it could facilitate his task. At any rate, the Presbyterians rejected his scheme.[3]

[1] *L.P.*, 23132, f. 141, Nov. 2, 1669; Airy, *L.P.*, II. 153–154, Lauderdale to Moray; *L.P.*, 23132, f. 161, Nov. 22, 1669, Moray to Lauderdale. In addition to the Act of Supremacy, the Scottish Parliament passed on the same day the Militia Act, which ensured to Charles an army of 20,000 men ready to march when and where he should please to command. Of this, as well as of two minor Acts of November 30, one of them "to make parishes liable for insolences against ministers," and "one containing severe certification against such as paid not bishops' dues and ministers' stipends," Moray wrote to Lauderdale in hearty approval. *L.P.*, 23132, ff. 175, 187, 202.

[2] J. Willcock, *A Scots Earl in Covenanting Times*, 1907, 177–181.

[3] *L.P.*, 23134, f. 110, Aug. 26, 1670, Moray to Lauderdale.

After 1670 Sir Robert took no part in political life ; [1] and, in view of the increasing violence of Lauderdale's policy, this is not to be regretted. It has been seen that his friendship with Lauderdale had been weakened in 1668. In November, 1670, they must have quarrelled ; and, although, on the 19th of January, 1671, Moray wrote a letter in which he expressed his desire to forget what had happened, the reconciliation seems to have been little more than verbal. Certainly in the summer of 1671 they were not on good terms.[2] According to Mackenzie, the original cause of their quarrel was the marriage of Lauderdale to Lady Dysart on the 17th of February, 1672, six weeks after the death of his first wife.[3] This is incorrect, but no doubt it did not improve their relations. After Lauderdale's return from Scotland, where he and his wife had aroused universal discontent in 1672,[4] Moray told him that he had "betrayed his country." [5] Such frankness was unpardonable, and even Sir Robert's death did not diminish the antipathy with which Lauderdale thenceforth thought of him.[6]

[1] Except on one occasion. Early in 1671 Burnet was asked by Lauderdale and Moray whether polygamy was "in any case lawful under the Gospel," and Burnet wrote in reply that it was. Clarendon had fallen from power in 1667, but his enemies felt that they "were not safe as long as the Duke [his son-in-law] had so much credit with the King, and the Duchess had so much power over him ; so they fell on propositions of a strange nature to ruin them." As Charles II. had no legitimate children, some suggested means of getting rid of the Queen so that the King might marry a second wife. "Others talked of polygamy, and officious persons thrust themselves into anything that would contribute to their advancement." (Clarke and Foxcroft, *Life of Burnet*, 103 ; Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 469–471.) The incident is a regrettable one in Sir Robert's career. Although in general of a most charitable disposition, he seems to have entertained against Clarendon a personal dislike. (*L.P.*, 23128, f. 225 ; *H.M.C. Reports*, Vol. 37 (1904), *Cal. of MSS. of Marquis of Bath*, I. 43.)

[2] Airy, *L.P.*, II. 212 ; Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 533.

[3] G. Mackenzie, *op. cit.*, 217–218 ; T. Clarke and H. Foxcroft, *Life of Burnet*, 106.

[4] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 600–607.

[5] J. Aubrey, *Lives of Eminent Men*, ed. A. Clark, 1898, II. 81 ; J. Kirkton, *Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland*, 260.

[6] This appears from a letter written by Lauderdale to Kincardine on July 7, 1673, three days after Moray's death. "Had he died a year ago, I should have been very much troubled for him, but he cured me of that. One use I shall make of it : I shall be very unwilling to dine with the Lord Chancellor, seeing his meat digests very ill." On the day of his death Moray had dined

That event took place with unexpected suddenness on the 4th of July, 1673. On the following day Aubrey informed Anthony Wood: [1] "Yesterday morning I waited on my ever to be honoured friend, Sir Robert Moray, and spent three hours discoursing with him in his chambers, where also came in Dr. Grew, Mr. Gregory, and Dr. Wms. . . . Sir Robert was to my thinking as well as wont to be: at eight last night was suddenly taken with an acid flegme and died in half-an-hour." Another account is somewhat different. "On Friday last Sir Robert Moray dined at my Lord Chancellor's and seemed very well, and about five in the afternoon, walking in the Privy Garden, and endeavouring to cough, returned to his chamber, to which he was scarce come but was choked with his flegme, and died presently." [2] On the Saturday "he was opened," [3] and on the Sunday he was buried in Westminster Abbey by order of the King.[4]

with the Lord Chancellor. (See J. Kirkton, *op. cit.*, p. 260 for this letter.) In November, 1673, Lauderdale met with a good deal of opposition in the Scottish Parliament. The chiefs of the opposition were Tweeddale and Hamilton in Scotland, and Shaftesbury in England. Lauderdale had not anticipated it, and he imputed to Moray the origination of the whole design (Burnet, *O.T.*, II. 39). This shows that his feeling of hostility to Sir Robert still existed. There is no proof that he was right in his conjecture. Neither in the *Tweeddale MSS.* nor in the *Hamilton Papers* are there any letters which even suggest it. But the thing is not impossible in itself, nor would it be discreditable to Moray if it were true that he planned this opposition. Certainly he was in touch with Shaftesbury, the Lord Chancellor (see the letter mentioned above in this footnote).

[1] *Wood MSS.* F. 39 (Bodl.), f. 219. *Ashmolean MSS.* (Wood) 1860.

[2] *Letters to Joseph Williamson*, Cam. Socy., 1874, Henry Ball to Sir J. W., July 7, 1673.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Evelyn's Diary*, ed. H. Wheatley, 1906, II. 292–3. (July 6, 1673). The grave is in the Poet's Corner, and Moray's name is inscribed on the floor of the Abbey beside those of Davenant and some others.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ROYAL SOCIETY

Sir Robert Moray was not only a soldier and a statesman: he was also a man of science. To Science, indeed, he turned with relief from the activities which have been already examined. Long before 1660 it was Science rather than War or Politics to which he wished to devote himself. Sir Philip Vernatti, writing to him from Batavia on the 6th of January, 1664, says:

"I had the honour to kiss your hands at the Hague in the year 1647 or 1648,[1] when you had some eminent employ in a military way at the Court of France, and to proffer my services to you; but was dissuaded by you to follow that kind of profession, but counselled rather to follow my studies, till mere necessity forced me otherwise." [2]

Writing to Alexander Bruce, on the 20th of May, 1660, Moray confessed that as early as 1651 he had been averse to political employment.[3]

Not only had it been his wish to live the scholar's life, but by 1660 the scientific knowledge he had acquired was very considerable. It is true that it is uncertain whether he studied at a University; but in so far as an interest in the new or scientific learning was concerned, attendance at either a Scottish or a French University would not be of much value. The Universities were rather hostile to science than other-

[1] It was in 1648 between May and September, most probably in August. *Cf. ante*, Ch. III. p. 59.

[2] *Letter Books of the Royal Society*, I. f. 412.

[3] *Kincardine Papers* (Douglas Transcripts), May 20, 1660.

were and it was amongst amateurs, gentlemen of leisure, or men of action that its devotees were chiefly to be found.[1] In Paris, for example, during the fourth and fifth decades of the century, there was an informal society of which Descartes, Mersenne, Gassendi, Pascal and Montmort were members.[2] Moray's active service as a soldier on the Continent would not hinder him from being frequently in Paris. When the summer campaigns were over, officers dispersed whither they chose. Moreover, Burnet and Gordon write as if he had known Richelieu somewhat intimately, which implies that he was no stranger to the French capital. Whether or not he was introduced to its circle of eminent mathematicians, as Hobbes and Petty were,[3] he would become acquainted with their work.

His interest in Science goes at least as far back as the fourth decade of the century. At that time he was " extrêmement adonné à la musique, tant la théorie que la pratique." [4] Shortly before 1640, in the company of engineers, he interested himself in the water-pipes at Islington ; and he tells his friend Bruce that, in Cardinal Richelieu's time, he was acquainted with the book-shops in Duke Lane in London.[5] He was busy with his studies during part at least of the period when he was a prisoner in Bavaria.[6] He gave some time to the science of motion, and to the phenomena of magnetism, in connection with which he corresponded with Kircherus.[7] It is important also to notice that, when Moray was in London during 1645 and 1646, the nucleus of the Royal Society was formed; and although his name does not appear

[1] Tannery, " Les Sciences en Europe " in Lavisse et Rambaud, *Histoire Générale*, V. 450–1.

[2] *Ibid.*, VI. 396 ; V. 453 ; Maury, *Les Académiés d'Autrefois*, 1864 edn., I. 10.

[3] Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, III. Chap. 12, p. 572 ; Fitzmaurice, *Life of Petty*, 5–6.

[4] *Oeuvres Complètes de Christiaan Huygens*, La Société Hollandaise des Sciences, La Haye, 1888-1905. *Correspondance*, III. No. 884, Aug. 9, 1661.

[5] *K.P.*, Dec. 14/24, 1657 ; April 19/29, 1658.

[6] Nov. 1643 to April 1645.

[7] *K.P.*, April 13/23 and 5/15, 1658.

in Dr. Wallis' list of those who attended the original meetings, the new departure which had been made would certainly interest him.[1] From 1650 until 1652 very little is known of Sir Robert. He hardly figures in politics, and his work of recruiting had come to an end. Probably this interval of leisure was utilised as his sojourn in Bavaria had been. It is significant that in 1651 he had correspondents in Switzerland.[2] The letters are not extant, but they can hardly have been political. After the Glencairn Rising was over, and exile became a necessity in 1655, Moray enjoyed complete freedom for his scientific pursuits. But even before he left Scotland, during the dismal wanderings amongst the Highlands and Islands after Middleton's defeat in July, 1654, he was observing curious natural phenomena.[3]

Thus, in spite of pre-occupations, Sir Robert had not been without leisure. Nor must it be forgotten that the life which he had led abroad must have helped to foster in him one element of the new scientific spirit, its indifference to the particular ecclesiastical connection of those who were interested in the new learning. In addition, he acquired on the Continent a knowledge of French, Dutch, and German, perhaps even of Italian.[4] This would be of the greatest utility, because scientific writers were beginning to adopt the vernacular languages instead of Latin.[5]

It was not until 1660 that he was to do anything of importance for the advancement of Science. This could be done either by original discoveries or by helping to found and sus-

[1] Th. Hearne's edn. of *Peter Langtoft's Chronicle*, Appendix to Preface.

[2] *Corr. of the Earls of Ancrum and Lothian*, Edin. 1875, II. 332.

[3] *Cf. Register Books and Guard Books of the Royal Society.* His papers on Barnacles and on Strange Tides in the Western Islands prove this. *Register Bk.* I. 15–16, 95–98.

[4] *K.P.*, Oct. 12/22, 1657, Moray advises Bruce to learn Dutch, and suggests that he knows it himself.

Ibid., Jan. 10, 1658. This letter suggests that he may have been familiar with the works of Tasso and Ariosto. In the *R.S. Guard Bk.* VIII. (i), no. 7, is a short account in German of a comet seen in Croatia. Moray communicated this account to the Royal Society.

[5] Tannery in Lavisse et Rambaud, V. 452.

tain useful institutions. It was in work of the latter kind that Moray was to play an important part.

His interest in Science and the foundation of the Royal Society exemplified a movement—the chief movement indeed—of the century.[1] The beginning of the seventeenth century saw the definitive commencement of modern Science, and the remainder of it saw progress in the natural or observational Sciences (such as Botany, Zoology, Anatomy, Physiology, Medicine, and Chemistry), and, to a much greater degree, in the mathematico-physical Sciences.[2] It has been pointed out that the Universities were not, on the whole, friendly to this development, but that gentlemen of leisure and men of affairs chiefly contributed to it. They met in informal societies, after the example of the literary Academies of England and France.[3] Eventually, the Governments began to interest themselves in the movement, though their interference was dictated by practical motives.[4] Thus, instead of informal societies, Academies were founded under ducal or royal patronage, at Florence in 1657, in France in 1666, and elsewhere.[5]

England had her share in this general progress. She could boast of Harvey's discoveries in Physiology, and Francis Bacon had proclaimed the principles of the new movement. The informal meetings which began in London in 1645 continued to be held there until 1648. In the latter year, some of the members migrated to Oxford, and in 1651 assumed the name of the Philosophical Society of Oxford. Wilkins, Wallis, Goddard, Petty, Willis, and Boyle were the most distinguished amongst them. The London section continued to meet until about 1658, usually at Gresham College, the chief members being Brouncker, Evelyn, Ent, Ball, Hill, and

[1] Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, VII. (ii), 185.

[2] Tannery in Lavisse et Rambaud, VI. 406–415.

[3] *Ibid.*, VI. 394–98. Also *Cambridge Modern History*, V. 739–741.

[4] Tannery in Lavisse et Rambaud, VI. 394–98.

[5] *Ibid.*, VI. 394–98. Also *Cambridge Modern History*, V. 739–41.

Henshaw. In 1658 soldiers began to quarter in the College, and the re-unions became impossible.[1]

The Restoration of the King was followed by the resumption of the London meetings.[2] About this time a great many proposals were made for the foundation of a more formal society. Both Evelyn [3] and Cowley [4] had drawn up schemes of this kind. Sir Robert Moray himself had a " design " of a non-political nature, which he announced to Bruce in letters written from Colombe on the 19th of January and on the 20th of May, 1660.[5] Unfortunately he gives no details as to what the design was.

On the 28th of November, 1660, a notable meeting was held in Gresham College.

" These persons following, according to the usual custom of most of them, met together at Gresham College to hear Mr. Wren's lecture, viz. the Lord Brouncker, Mr. Boyle, Mr. Bruce, Sir Robert Moray, Sir Paul Neil, Dr. Wilkins, Dr. Goddard, Dr. Petty, Mr. Ball, Mr. Rooke, Mr. Wren, Mr. Hill. And after the lecture was ended, they did according to the usual manner withdraw for mutual converse. Where amongst other matters that were discoursed of, something was offered about a design of founding a College for the promoting of Physico-Mathematical Experimental Learning. And because they had these frequent occasions of meeting with one another, it was proposed that some course might be thought of to improve this meeting to a more regular way of debating things, and according to the manner in other countries, where there were voluntary associations of men in Academies. . . . At this meeting Dr. Wilkins was appointed to the chair."[6]

A week later Sir Robert announced that the King approved and would encourage the design.[7]

[1] *The Record of the Royal Society*, 1901 edn., 3.
[2] T. Sprat, *History of the Royal Society*, 2nd edn., 1702, 58–9.
[3] C. R. Weld, *History of the Royal Society*, London, 1848, I. 42–9.
[4] Grosart's edition of *Cowley's Works*, 2 vols., 1876, II. 287–91.
[5] *K.P.*, Jan. 1, May 20, 1660.
[6] *Journal Bks. of the R.S.*, I. 1.
[7] *Ibid.*, I., Dec. 5, 1660.

Thus it is clear that, as Aubrey, Sprat, and Burnet assert, Moray was only one of many who entertained the idea of such a foundation.[1] There could not, in fact, be one originator. Many had to be already convinced of the desirability of a Society before it could be founded. Yet Moray was the first President of the Society, and he held office until its Incorporation by Royal Charter.[2] At first this appears somewhat surprising. He had not been a frequenter of the pre-Restoration meetings, and he was not an Englishman. Why, then, was he chosen to fill the position? He had scientific knowledge, but he was certainly not the most eminent man of science among the members. Other considerations must, therefore, have proved of more weight. In the first place, he was a titled personage, and it was considered important to have many of this class in the Society[3] and one of them as President.[4] Debate would be more dignified and courteous, and this would help to increase the esteem for the Society amongst the upper classes. The French Academy of Sciences was exposed to some ridicule by the turbulence of its members, of whom few were men of the world.[5] Again, it was felt that Science would be studied with more disinterestedness by men who did not make their livelihood as scholars.[6] Through their presence, the Society would be less at the beck of King, ministers, and courtiers. The French Academicians were

[1] Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, ed. Clark, 1898, II. 81; Sprat, *op. cit.*, 58; Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 342–4.

[2] This is virtually true. The President was elected monthly (see *The Record of the R.S.*, 1901 edn., 6). Sir R. Moray was elected on March 6, 1661, and re-elected April 10, 1661. He was President on Aug. 28, 1661, and on Feb. 5, June 11 and 18, July 2, 9, 16, 1662. Wilkins presided on May 21, 28, June 4, 1662; Boyle on June 25 and July 23. These are the only occasions upon which the matter is mentioned in the *Journal Book* (I). Aubrey and Burnet say he was first President.

[3] *R.S. Register Book*, I. f. 25. Colonel Tuke's relation concerning the Academy at Paris.

[4] Monconys, *Voyages*, 1677 edn., 26. *Cf.* Voyage en Angleterre.

[5] L. Maury, *Les Académies d'Autrefois*, I. 29.

[6] Sprat, 67–8.

frequently called away from important studies in order to apply their knowledge to comparatively trivial affairs.[1] Secondly, Moray was known to be a religious man of high character. The Society was accused in certain quarters of being hostile to religion, and the works of Glanvil and Sprat prove that it was thought necessary to defend it from such attacks.[2] Perhaps it was felt that the nomination of a man like Moray would help to disarm criticism. Still, from either point of view, others might have been chosen. Hence it is probable that Sir Robert was appointed because of his friendship with the King more than for any other reason.

There are three aspects of his services to the Society; while President, he obtained for it a Royal Charter; as a member of the Council he played a leading part in the attempt to improve its finances; and as a member of the Society he took a large share in its scientific activities.

It has been mentioned that on the 5th of December, 1660, Sir Robert announced to the Society that the King was pleased to hear of the new design and that he intended to encourage it. The best way to do so would be first of all to present the Society with a Charter, but some time passed before this was done. On the 21st of June, 1661, Moray wrote hopefully to Huygens: "Dans quelques jours nous espérons que notre Société sera établie de la bonne sorte."[3] But it was not until the 16th of October that he was able to announce definite progress. On that date "Sir Robert Moray acquainted the Society that he and Sir Paul Neil kissed the King's hand in the company's name, and is entreated by them to return most humble thanks to his Majesty for the reference he was pleased to grant of their petition; and for the favour

[1] Maury, *op. cit.*, 37–41.

[2] Sprat, 345–58. *Cf.* Jos. Glanvil, *Philosophia Pia: Or a Discourse of the Religious Temper and Tendencies of the Experimental Philosophy, which is profest by the R.S.* (1671). Also *Plus Ultra* (1668).

[3] Huygens, *Corr.*, III. no. 869, June 21, 1661; no. 886, Aug. 27, 1661.

and honour he was pleased to offer of himself to be entered one of the Society." [1]

Many months were still to elapse before the Charter passed the seals, and not until the 13th of August, 1662, was it read before the Society.[2] It proved to be imperfect, and Sir Robert, though no longer President, was commissioned to give to Sir Henry Bennet a summary of the powers still required (March 25, 1663).[3] On the 22nd of April the second Charter passed the Great Seal.[4] On the 4th of December, 1666, Moray moved in Council that "the Council would take care to supply the defects of the Charter of the Society."[5] The motion was approved, and in 1669 a third Charter—that under which the Society is still governed—was granted.[6]

There can be no doubt that Moray exerted himself more than anyone else in this matter. On the 13th of August, 1662, the Society resolved that "Sir Robert Moray should be thanked for his concern and care in promoting the constitution of the Society into a Corporation." [7] Huygens remarks in a letter to Chapelain of the 14th of July, 1661: "Vous savez quel est le dessein de ces Messieurs . . . Ils ont une personne entre autres qui travaille avec grand zèle à l'établissement de l'Académie, et qui en est comme l'âme: c'est le chevalier Morray." On the 1st of June, 1663, the same writer congratulates Sir Robert on the Incorporation: "Je sais que ce vous sera une grande satisfaction de voir bien réussir ce à quoi vous avez travaillé avec tant de zèle et de constance." [8]

[1] *R.S. Journal Books*, I.

[2] Evelyn's *Diary*, ed. H. Wheatley, 1906, II. 151.

[3] *R.S. Journal Books*, I.

[4] *The Record of the R.S.*, 7.

[5] *Journal Books of the Council of the R.S.*, I.

[6] *The Record of the R.S.*, 7.

[7] *R.S. Journal Books*, I.

[8] Huygens, *op. cit.*, III. no. 873; IV. no. 1119. According to Draper, royal recognition saved the Society from extinction. J. W. Draper, *Hist. of the Conflict of Religion and Science*, 1875, 307.

It was with a view to the increase of the Society's funds that Moray was so anxious to obtain its Incorporation. This is clear from his letter to Huygens of the 14th of May, 1663. " Nous commençons maintenant à travailler à l'établissement de notre Société avec plus de vigueur que nous n'avons pu jusqu'ici ; parce que la patente du Roi qui l'érige en une Corporation avec plusieurs privilèges nous a été expédiée depuis cinq ou six jours, comme nécessaire à la rendre capable selon les lois du pays à recevoir donations et standi in iudicio etc., de sorte que nous nous appliquons aux autres moyens nécessaires à la prosecution du dessein que nous nous sommes proposés, comme la constitution de la Société ; ce qui touche le fonds requis pour fournir aux dépenses des expériences."

The same motive is even more evident from a passage in the already quoted letter from Huygens to Chapelain. " Il est bien auprès du Roi d'Angleterre, et ne cessera pas jusqu'à ce qu'il ait obtenu de Sa Majesté un fonds et revenu certain pour servir aux frais que dans l'assemblée on fera aux expériences, car jusqu'ici eux-mêmes y ont fourni." [1]

From the latter quotation it appears that Moray was convinced of the necessity of funds from the Government. The Society had not money enough to undertake expensive, though, it might be, highly useful experiments.[2] The difficulty experienced in obtaining subscriptions from the members showed that it was not likely to be self-supporting.[3] Private donations would be welcomed ; but it was improbable that they would be numerous, for the public was sceptical as to the complete disinterestedness of the *virtuosi*.[4] In these circumstances Government aid seemed essential.

The financial policy of the Society was, of course, a matter for the Council to determine, but Sir Robert was the leading spirit in this connection. In October, 1662, the King ordered the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to make the Royal Society a grant out " of the fractions of the debentures vested in us

[1] Huygens, *op. cit.*, IV. no. 1114 ; III. no. 873.

[2] Balthasar de Monconys, *Voyages* (Voyage en Angleterre), 66.

[3] The entries in the *Journal Bks.* of the Society and of the Council show this.

[4] Sprat, 67–8, 437–8.

by the late Act of Parliament for the settlement of that our kingdom. You shall make a grant accordingly to R. Boyle and Sir R. Moray, . . . in trust for the Royal Society." [1] It was doubtless as a result of Moray's unflagging energy that the King had been induced to take definite action.[2] Unfortunately, the Lord Lieutenant did not find it convenient to do as Charles had recommended, even after a second royal letter was sent to him on the 29th of December, 1663.[3] The King did not force matters, and nothing was obtained from this source.

On the 3rd of February, 1664, Sir Robert moved in Council that " every one of the Council might think on ways to raise a revenue for carrying on the design and work of the Society." Various suggestions were made, but the proposal which was eventually agreed upon was brought forward by Moray himself on the 9th of March following.[4] He moved that " the Council would make it their business to get an interest in Chelsea College, and to procure the reversion thereof." [5] The grounds attached would serve for " experiments of gardening and agriculture," and " by the neighbourhood of the river " they would have " excellent opportunity of making all trials that belong to the water." [6] The building would be as useful for the purposes of the Society, which had, as yet, no meeting place of its own and continued to assemble in Gresham College. Great difficulty was experienced in realising this proposal. Various private individuals asserted their claims to prior consideration. In order to deal with the matter the Council appointed committee after committee, on fourteen of which

[1] *Calendar of State Papers* (*Ireland*), 1660–1662, p. 602.

[2] Huygens, *Corr.*, III. no. 873. July 14, 1661.

[3] *Cal. of S.P.* (*Ireland*), 1660–1662, p. 668.

[4] *Journal Bks. of the Council of the R.S.*, I.

[5] Chelsea College had been founded by James I. and was built upon a piece of ground of six acres in extent. The College was intended for " the defence of the true religion established within the realm, and for the refuting of errors and heresies repugnant to the same." But owing to lack of funds the institution could not be maintained. It had fallen into decay. (Weld, *History of the R.S.*, I. 171-172, 204–205.)

[6] Sprat, 434.

Moray's name figures; but it was not until the 8th of April, 1669, that the grant passed the Privy Seal.[1] There was trouble even after the College became the Society's property. Eventually it was proposed that it should be let to a tenant, but none could be found, as the question of right appeared still to be undetermined. In fact, the Society gained nothing by the possession of it until 1682, when it was sold to the King for £1,300 and the money thus obtained invested in the East India Company.[2]

A third attempt was made in Moray's time to procure funds. On the 27th of September, 1667, the Society took possession of Chelsea College, although the grant had not yet been made.[3] It might not be able to retain possession, and therefore Dr. Wilkins moved on the 30th of September that subscriptions should be requested for the building of a new College. Henry Howard was willing to supply the site, and subscriptions were to be asked from members first before an appeal was made to the public. On the 5th of November, the Council agreed to this plan. On the 11th of January, 1668, a Committee was appointed to solicit subscriptions from those Fellows who were considered able and willing to contribute.[4] Sir R. Moray had gone to Scotland in the preceding summer, but a letter was written to him by Oldenburg, the Secretary, in the name of the Council. He was to solicit money from Scottish members of the Society, and, although no names were mentioned in the letter, it appears from the *Journal Book* of the Council that Argyle, Crawford-Lindsay, Kincardine, Tweeddale, and Lord Stermont were the individuals from whom contributions were anticipated.[5]

Like Brouncker and Howard, Sir Robert Moray approved of this plan and promised his assistance. But only 24 out

[1] Weld, *op. cit.*, I. 214; *Journal Books of the Council of the R.S.* I. *passim.*

[2] Weld. *op. cit.*, I. 217, 279.

[3] *Ibid.*, I. 204–5.

[4] *Journal Books of the Council of the R. S.*, I. under dates noted above.

[5] *Letter Bks. of the R.S.* II. f. 132, Jan. 30, 1668; I. Jan. 11, 1668.

of 207 members subscribed, and the total sum amounted to £1,075. Boyle had been hostile to the scheme at first,[1] and, according to Pepys, it had a bad effect upon the members. "Several I saw hang off; and I doubt it will spoil the Society, for it breeds faction and ill-will, and becomes burdensome to some that cannot or would not do it."[2] It was certainly open to the criticism that it had been too hastily agreed upon by the Council. There could have been no harm in waiting to see whether a grant of Chelsea College would be made, and indeed when that grant appeared certain, Wilkins' scheme was abandoned.[3]

The labour which Moray expended in obtaining for the Society a Charter and in attempts to procure for it adequate funds was undertaken solely in order to facilitate its scientific progress. According to Sprat, the members of the new institution did not intend to investigate the nature of God nor of the soul of Man, but limited themselves to making "faithful records of all the works of nature or art which can come within their reach."[4] Eventually the mass of knowledge acquired would serve as material for a theory or explanation of the world, but meantime the task was one of mere inquiry. Science also was from the first to improve gradually the conditions of life for mankind.[5] Even so, the enterprise was a vast one, and of this the members were well aware.[6] As Moray said in a letter to Monconys, it would provide "assez de besogne à tous les habiles gens qui sont ou seront dans le monde."[7]

It was therefore of the utmost importance to set to work in the right way, and there were three main lines along which

[1] Weld, *op. cit.*, I. 207–8, 211.
[2] Pepys, *Diary*, April 2, 1668.
[3] Weld, *op. cit.*, I. 214.
[4] Sprat, 61, 81–3.
[5] Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, III. 582–6.
[6] J. Glanvil, *Plus Ultra*, 7, 90–1.
[7] Monconys, *Voyages* (Voyage en Angleterre), 66.

the Society worked.[1] To Observation and Experiment more importance was attached than to anything else.[2] The Society imposed tasks of this nature on a member or group of members, sometimes, but not always, taking into account their preferences for certain branches of Science.[3] As the following extracts from the *Journal Books* show, Moray's name frequently occurs on Committees appointed for particular experiments.

June 4, 1662, Sir Robert Moray and others entreated to try the variation of the needle at Whitehall;

January 29, 1663, Sir Robert Moray and Brouncker ordered to observe at Whitehall the next eclipse of the moon;

March 25, 1663, Sir R. Moray, Tuke, Wilkins appointed Curators of the experiment of producing maggots by cheese and sack;

August 5, 1663, Sir R. Moray was desired to get two hollow balls made for the putting of gunpowder into one, and aurum fulminans into the other, and to make them red-hot, to see whether the gunpowder would melt in one and the aurum fulminans in the other;

August 31, 1664, Sir R. Moray gave an account of the experiment again made on St. Paul's steeple, with a pendulum of 200 foot long, with an appendant weight of 14 pounds, viz., that it made two vibrations in 15″.[4]

Sometimes experiments or observations which Moray suggested were imposed upon himself alone or upon some other single member.[5] But it was not always thought possible for one man to carry them out. This applied especially to the most important suggestion which he made. On the 15th of April, 1663, "occasion being given to discourse of

[1] I have here followed the authors of *The Record of the Royal Society*, 1901 edn. Sprat subdivides the labours of the Society into many different types (see *History*, 155), but they really fall into three kinds, and even these, as will be shown, cannot be wholly distinguished from each other.

[2] *The Record of the R.S.*, 1901 edn. 16; Th. Thomson, *History of the R.S.*, 1812 edn., 6.

[3] Sprat, 84–5.

[4] Examples might be multiplied.

[5] *Journal Bks. of the R.S.*, I., Nov. 5, 1662.

the stars discovered by Dr. Palmer, a minister, Sir R. Moray moved that a survey might be made of the stars of the zodiac by the best telescopes for the discovery of new stars and the rectifying of places of stars already known, for which purpose Sir R. Moray offered himself to take his share. Mr. Ball undertook the survey of a whole sign, Mr. Hook of as much as he could." Under the 29th of April it is recorded that Sir Robert and Brouncker took Sagittarius in the zodiac; Mr. Ball, Libra; Pope and Croon, Aries; Wren and Hook, Taurus.[1] "They have suggested" wrote Sprat, "the making a perfect survey, map, and table of all the fixed stars within the zodiac. . . . This has been approved and begun, several Fellows having their portions in the heavens allotted to them."[1] The task was in line with one of the astronomical developments of the century. Tycho Brahe had catalogued 1,000 stars, while in 1673 Hevelius included in his *Machina Cælestis* a catalogue comprising the exact positions of 1,564 stars. But it was Flamsteed of the Royal Society who laboured most in this connection: he catalogued 3,000 in the *Historia Cælestis Britannica*, which was published in 1723 after his death.[3] Thus a member of the Society which welcomed Moray's proposal finally carried out the plan.

Sir Robert does not appear to have been altogether satisfied with the methods of the Society in regard to Experiments. On the 4th of December, 1666, he proposed that "the Council would take into consideration how the experiments at the public meetings of the Society might be best carried on—whether by a continued series of experiments, taking in collateral ones as they occur, or by going on in that promiscuous way that has obtained heretofore." But to judge from the *Journal Books* very little was done to improve

[1] *Journal Books of the R.S.*, I.

[2] Sprat, 190–1.

[3] Tannery in Lavisse et Rambaud, V. 479–80; VI. 400–5.

matters. On the 11th of February, 1669, indeed, the President proposed the appointment of "two Committees for considering of and directing experiments, to be made from time to time at their weekly meetings." Moray was a member of one of these Committees; but they seem to have left matters very much as they were.[1] The method of the French Academy of Sciences was similarly defective: Perrault, one of the most distinguished of its members, tried in vain to remedy matters by drawing up a plan of work.[2]

The reading of Papers was not regarded as of so much consequence as Experiment. Nevertheless, this was not a negligible aspect of the Society's work.[3] The Papers sometimes took the form of reports on Experiments imposed on members but conducted elsewhere than at Gresham College. Thus Moray submitted the results of the "experiment of the instrument for sounding without a line or cord," in which he and Brouncker had co-operated.[4] But they were not necessarily of this type. A great many of Moray's Papers are accounts of curious phenomena which he has seen in various countries and at different times, or of some industry unknown in England of which he explains the methods. He describes, for example, a peculiar spring near Chertsey, or the curiosities he has seen in the course of a journey in the south and west of England.[5] On other occasions he gives an account of certain strange tides among the Scottish Hebrides, of a remarkable echo at Roseneath, of Barnacles, or of Worms in Ash-timber. To the other category belongs his account of the making of malt in Scotland.[6]

The various "Histories," as they were called, which the

[1] *Journal Bks. of the Council of the R.S.*, I.; *Journal Bks. of the R.S.*, IV.

[2] L. Maury, *Les Académies d'Autrefois*, I. 15–16.

[3] *The Record of the R.S.*, 16.

[4] *R.S. Register Bk.*, I. f. 153.

[5] *R.S. Guard Bks.*, VI. no. 13, July 22, 1663; VII. (i), no. 10, Oct. 19, 1664.

[6] *R.S. Register Bks.*, I. f. 16, March 8, 1661; II. f. 52, Dec. 3, 1662; I. ff. 15–16, March 8, 1661; II. f. 95, Jan. 7, 1663.

Society received from different members were really communications similar in kind to the Papers which were read. A great number of the "Histories" dealt with Trades, and it was the intention of the Fellows to make a large collection of them. Some were to be printed, and the rest could be profitably consulted in manuscript.

"They have "assured grounds of confidence" wrote Sprat, "that, when this attempt shall be completed, it will be found to bring innumerable benefits to all practical arts. When all the secrets of manufactures shall be discovered . . . it will soon be determined how far they themselves may be promoted, and what new consequences may thence be deduced. . . . In short, by this help, the worst artificers will be well instructed by considering the methods and tools of the best. And the greatest inventors will be exceedingly enlightened, because they will have in their view the labours of many men, many places, and many times, wherewith to compare their own. This is the surest and most effectual means to enlarge the invention."[1]

The particular trade of which Moray undertook to write the History was Masonry.[2] He was busy over it while absent from London during the Plague, and in his letters to Oldenburg from Salisbury and Oxford he described the progress which he was making. He had written over fifty quarto pages, and there was much more to follow, but he was not satisfied either with the matter or with the style of his production.[3] On the 14th and 21st of March, 1666, he was requested to hand it in to the Society, but he declined on both occasions, alleging that it was still imperfect.[4] Sprat includes a History of Masonry in his list of those which had been given in by the time he wrote,[5] and the statement is probably correct, as Moray was one of those to whom Sprat's

[1] Sprat, 257–9, 310.

[2] Moray was a Freemason, and always attached the mason's sign to his signature. *Cf. ante*, Ch. I. p. *n.* 3.

[3] *R.S. Letter Books*, M. Sept. 16 and 26, 1665.

[4] *R.S. Journal Books*, II.

[5] *Journal Books of the Council of the R.S.*, I. May 3, 1665; Sprat, 257, 258.

book was submitted before publication. But the History has not been preserved in the Archives of the Society.[1]

Moray's Papers contained in the Register Books and Guard Books are all interesting, but it cannot be said that they are important. For the most part they deal merely with curious isolated phenomena. The knowledge of such facts, however, might be useful in overthrowing a hasty generalisation, and Moray's communication on strange tides in the Western Islands probably had this effect. Writing to Sir Robert on the 7th of November, 1665, Oldenburg remarks : " Kircherus hath inscribed a Latin letter of yours concerning the irregular tides of the Western Isles of Scotland, where he makes honourable mention of you, but waves the solution of the phenomena, under a pretence of not finding the description of the observations full enough to give any judgment upon it. I suppose he found it repugnant to his theory of tides, and therefore finds fault with the observations to rid himself of the difficulty of reconciling them to his speculations." [2]

It is impossible to distinguish on all occasions between Experiments imposed and Papers read or given in, because the latter were sometimes the necessary complement of the former. Similarly it is difficult to differentiate always between the reading of Papers and the method which must now be mentioned. " From the very first, much of the energy of the Society was spent in foreign Correspondence, . . . in seeking news, or in instigating researches in foreign places." [3] This Correspondence was necessitated by the lack of scientific Journals, and by the aim of the Society to " make a record of all the works of Nature or Art which can come within their reach." This implied the reception of information from everywhere and about everything, so

[1] One of the *Guard Books* (vol. XXV) contains Histories of Trades, but the History of Masonry is not included.

[2] *R.S. Letter Books*, I, f. 18.

[3] *The Record of the R.S.*, 16.

that the help of non-members and of foreign students was necessary. It is in this connection that the international character of the new learning is most strongly manifested. Sometimes a member was asked to obtain information abroad about a particular matter. Or again, an individual member or a group of members would be requested to draw up a formal series of Queries. "Their manner of gathering and dispersing queries is this," says Sprat [1]:

"First, they require some of their particular Fellows to examine all treatises and descriptions of the natural and artificial productions of those countries in which they would be informed. At the same time they employ others to discourse with the seamen, travellers, tradesmen, and merchants, who are likely to give them the best light. Out of this united intelligence from men and books, they compose a body of questions concerning all the observable things of those places. These Papers being produced in their weekly assemblies are augmented or contracted as they see occasion. And then the Fellows themselves are wont to undertake their distribution into all quarters according as they have the convenience of correspondence."

Usually, however, the Correspondence was of a less formal character, and consisted in an interchange of more or less scientific news, and in exhortations to labour in the cause of useful knowledge. The replies to the more formal queries sometimes assume the form of Papers.[2]

On various occasions Sir Robert took part in drawing up a series of inquiries. As early as the 6th of February, 1661, he was placed on a Committee "to consider of proper questions to be inquired of in the remotest parts of the world." [3] On the 26th of April, 1665, "Sir R. Moray moving that some inquiries might be drawn up to be sent to Mr. Howard's brother

[1] Sprat, 155–6.

[2] *R.S. Register Bks.*, II. f. 229. Of the Mineral of Liége. Contributed by the Liége Jesuits, to whom Moray had been asked to write about this matter. (*Journal Bks. of the R.S.*, I. May 8, 1661.)

[3] *R.S. Journal Bks.*, I. Feb. 6, 1661.

concerning observables in Hungary and Turkey, whither he is travelling; was desired that himself and the Secretary would draw up such inquiries." [1] More important were those which he helped to draw up for Sir Philip Vernatti in Batavia, and which Sprat included in his History as specimens of the work which the Society did in this way.[2]

He had correspondents in the East Indies [3] and in Africa,[4] in Jamaica,[5] Virginia,[6] and New England,[7] in Italy [8] and France,[9] in Holland [10] and Sweden; [11] and, nearer home, in Ireland [12] and Scotland.[13] The most important of these were Sir Philip Vernatti, John Winthrop, Christiaan Huygens, Balthazar de Monconys, and Sir Wm. Petty. He writes to the Jesuits of Liége about the making of copper ore in that town; he promises to procure information regarding the manner of making tar in Sweden or the materials used for colouring cloth in Scotland; and he exhorts John Winthrop to inquire into the wealth of New England in timber and minerals. The information which he receives is of the most varied kind. Lord Reay promises to find out what he can as to some curious glistening rocks off the north coast of Scotland, and from the same country are sent the measure-

[1] *R.S. Journal Bks.*, II. April 26, 1665.

[2] Sprat, 158–172.

[3] *R.S. Letter Bks.*, I. ff. 67, 204, 412, 415. To and from Vernatti.

[4] *R.S. Journal Bks.*, II. Dec. 23, 1663.

[5] *Cal. of State Papers* (*Colonial Series*), America and the W. Indies (1669–1674), 247, 387, 426, 479.

[6] *R.S. Letter Bks.*, I. 240; M. (1), ff. 37. June 12, 1668. From Alex. Moray in Virginia.

[7] *Corr. of Hartlib, Haak, etc. with John Winthrop*, Massachusetts Hist. Socy., Boston, 1878, 18–27, 30–32, 41–47.

[8] *R.S. Journal Bks.*, I, May 8, 1661. On a Committee to correspond with Duke Leopold.

[9] *R. S. Letter Bks.*, M. (1), ff. 28–31 (Monconys); *Letter Bks.* S. (1), f. 7 (Sorbière).

[10] Huygens, *Corr.*, vols. I–VII. *passim*.

[11] *R. S. Journal Bks.*, I. June 16, 1662.

[12] *R. S. Letter Bks.*, P. (1), ff. 11, 16, 23, 25, 26, 27 (Petty).

[13] *R. S. Letter Bks.*, QR. (1), f. 9 (Lord Reay), S. (1), ff. 24–27 (Sinclair); *R.S. Journal Bks.*, IV. Jan. 13, 1670.

ments of a giant child which had recently been born. Sir Wm. Petty, in Dublin, describes the new type of ship from which he hopes so much. Monconys relates his meetings with men of science in Germany and Italy, while someone sends from Paris an account of M. Raoux's new method of cutting for stone.[1] A Scottish clergyman in Virginia describes his planting of mulberry trees and suggests the desirability of a Scottish colony towards the south. Winthrop, further north, explains that the Indian wars have prevented him discovering much about the mineral wealth of the country. At times, presents from abroad accompany the letters, and go to increase the collection of curiosities in the Repository.

All this is of interest rather than of importance, but the correspondence with Huygens is of another order. Between 1660 and 1670 Huygens was undoubtedly the ablest and most conspicuous scientific man in Europe. The age of Descartes and Pascal was over, that of Newton and Leibnitz had not yet begun. Obviously it would be extremely useful for English men of science to learn about his doings, and they did so chiefly through the replies which Huygens made to Moray's communications. Moreover, Huygens attached a great value to the letters which Sir Robert sent him, full as they were of the latest scientific news from England, and of personal, as well as communicated, suggestions and criticisms as to the undertakings of the Dutch philosopher.

" Vous concluez votre lettre " writes Huygens, " par des excuses de m'avoir entretenu si longtemps, auxquelles je ne réponds rien, si non que je ne sais pas à quoi vous songez quand vous les faites. Croiriez-vous bien peut-être que je me lasse à lire vos lettres, si je ne vous faisais des protestations au contraire ? "[2]

In this connection, it is important to notice the following passage in Sprat :

" In the Low Countries, their interest and reputation has

[1] *R.S. Register Books*, II. f. 272. July 15, 1663.

[2] Huygens, *Corr.*, III. no. 940. Dec. 30, 1661.

been established by the friendship of some of their chief learned men, and principally of Hugenius. This gentleman has bestowed his pains on many parts of the speculative and practical mathematics with wonderful successes. And particularly, his applying the motion of pendulums to clocks and watches was an excellent invention. For thereby there may be a means found out of bringing the measures of time to an exact regulation : of which the benefits are infinite. In the prosecution of such discoveries, he has often required the aid of this Society ; he has received the light of their trials and a confirmation of his own, and has freely admitted their alterations or amendments. And this learned correspondence with him and many others is still continued even at this present time in the breach between our countries." [1]

Such were the chief activities of the Society in which Sir Robert played an important part. Writing on the 14th of July, 1668, Dr. Wallis congratulated him on his arrival from Scotland, and added that the Society would " benefit by the return of so active a member." [2] It will be clear from the course of this chapter that Wallis was not exaggerating. Indeed, the praise is somewhat too moderate. Huygens was more just when he spoke of Moray as the " soul " of the Society, and Burnet, who can hardly have known of this, used the same expression. " While he lived, he was the life and soul of that body." [3] On the whole, this is true. After his return from Scotland in 1668, there was a certain relaxation of effort. He wrote few letters, and he took less part in the proceedings generally.[4] No doubt the publication of the Philosophical Transactions made it less necessary to correspond, but it is probable that increasing age made him less able for the strenuous activity of earlier years.

An institution like the Royal Society could not long continue to exist without patronage and without securing public sympathy by great discoveries in Science. Moray

[1] Sprat, 127–8.
[2] *R.S. Letter Bks.*, II. f. 238.
[3] *O.T.*, I. 105.
[4] This is clear from an examination of the early Letter Bks., Register Bks., Guard Bks., and Journal Bks.

tried to secure funds for it, but without much success. It was not in his power to confer lustre upon its name by original discoveries. He was no Newton, and there were in the Society many lesser men than Newton who were Moray's superiors in scientific ability. One need only mention such men as Boyle and Hook, Wallis and Brouncker, Glisson and Willis, Graunt and Petty. But during the early years of its existence the Society was not only impoverished. It was an object of suspicion to many instead of enjoying the sympathy of all. The increase of its achievement would lessen this hostility, and Newton was immensely to strengthen its reputation. Meantime it was kept alive chiefly by an energetic enthusiasm, and by the determination of its members that it should continue to exist. By his interest in everything connected with the Society—its incorporation and its finances as well as its scientific labours—Moray was the most striking example of these sustaining qualities.

CHAPTER IX

CHARACTERISTICS, MORAL AND MENTAL

THE work of Sir Robert Moray in connection with the Royal Society necessitated great talent and implied a powerful and attractive character. It was his character, indeed, even more than his talents which impressed contemporaries. The most detailed accounts of him that we have—those of Burnet and Aubrey—are a description of his moral qualities much more than of his intellectual endowments. An account and estimate of his character ought, therefore, to precede a similar treatment of his intellectual interests and gifts.

That Moray was a sincerely religious man his intimate letters to Kincardine sufficiently prove. A few extracts from them will best indicate the nature of his religious thought. Religion, as a contemplation of things divine, seemed to him the most important thing in the world.

"The taking in, by the way, of a reflection upon God's goodness to you deserves my highest approbation. Such observations are ever worth their room. All our other most serious employments should be but as parentheses to contemplations of that nature, which is not only the noblest and most useful we can have on earth, but will be our eternal work in Heaven." [1]

This, of course, is not the assertion of a practice, but the statement of an ideal. It was an ideal, however, which a man of so many interests and occupations as Sir Robert certainly cannot have put into practice, unless perhaps during the few years of exile which he spent in Maastricht. It must

[1] *K.P.*, March 9/19, 1658.

be supposed, therefore, that Burnet exaggerates when he says of Moray that in the midst of camps and courts he spent hours every day at his devotions,[1] although even when he was busiest he seems to have set apart a brief space of time daily for self-examination and prayer.

As a result, he had come to hold definite ideas as to the nature and workings of the Deity. The dominant thought in his mind in this connection was that of the goodness and mercy of God. Even the sufferings which He sends to men are indications of these attributes.

" Many such things have befallen me in my life, which have given me so internal an acquaintance with God's goodness in such dealings, that I have much cause to thank Him for stooping so far as to give me so many and so pregnant sensible experiments for confirming my faith and His truth.[2] "

This passage is only typical of many, and it confirms what Burnet says of him that " he had noble and generous thoughts of God and religion."[3] Certainly he did not wholly forget the idea of the righteousness of the Deity, which the Puritans emphasised. " When God punishes, it is a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the Lord."[4] But that is an aspect which is by no means so frequently mentioned.

Like religious men in all times, he saw the hand of God in great events and in small. " If we were punctual in observing state matters, we might fall to setting of the world upon props. But we must leave it to the government of Him that made it."[5] Of the Restoration he says, " What a wonderful work hath the Lord God brought about in a little time ! "[6] On another occasion he writes of " a wonderful, I may say, miraculous kindness of God " which, by a sudden change of wind, saved a mutual friend from shipwreck.[7] In

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 105.
[2] *K.P.*, Feb. 4/14, 1658.
[3] Burnet, *O.T.*, *Supplement*, ed. H. Foxcroft, 44.
[4] *K.P.*, March 9/19, 1658.
[5] *Ibid.*, Feb. 26/March 8, 1658.
[6] *Ibid.*, May, 1660.
[7] *Ibid.*, Sept. 22/Oct. 2, 1657.

consequence Moray believed in the value of intercessory prayer.

"I should have chid you sore for concealing of your ague, if you had not told me that you did not know it yourself. . . . Although I do not forget you at any time in my devotions, yet some special addresses are to be made to Heaven on particular occasions, that must be known before they be remembered there. Whilst you are silent, you lack my special prayer as to the exigent."[1]

There is nothing original in these reflections. Yet there was something individualistic in his religious attitude, for it cannot be said that he belonged wholly to any one of the religious communities of the time. Just as Moray had milder thoughts of God than the Scottish Presbyterians and other Puritans, so he was broader in his ecclesiastical sympathies than they were, and this is sufficient to mark him off from them.[2] He had friends amongst Continental Catholics; he was on friendly terms with the liberally-minded Protestant clergy at Charenton, and he could appreciate highly the writings of the Lutheran Calixtus. Finally, he had no conscientious objections to Episcopacy as a form of Church Government. These facts make it certain that he had a sympathy with the forward religious movement of the century, with the Rationalism and Latitudinarianism in Theology which began amongst the Dutch Arminians, and found adherents amongst the reformed clergy of France, and in that section of the Anglican Church of which the Cambridge Platonists were the most illustrious members.[3]

But while, as regards opinions, Moray was something of a

[1] *K.P.*, Oct. 19/29, 1657.

[2] According to Aubrey, Sir Robert was a Presbyterian. He cannot have been a practising one after 1660, and he certainly did not believe in the Divine Right of Presbytery. He may have considered that, on the whole, it was the best type of Church government; and assuredly for Scotland he thought that it was so. This is the amount of truth in Aubrey's remark, but it is sufficient to show that, although he was willing to become an Anglican when the law required, yet he was in no sense an Anglican by conviction. (Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, II. 81.)

[3] J. Tulloch, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the 17th Century*, Edin., 1872, I. 19, 36, II. Ch. vii

Latitudinarian, there was an element in his religious and moral nature which was related to Puritanism. There was a certain asceticism in him, a contempt for the things of the world, and a rigorous curbing of human desires. This was really the chief element in that Stoicism of which he speaks so frequently, and which Burnet describes as one of his characteristics.[1] "I shall tell you" he writes to Kincardine in 1658, "it hath been my study, now 31 years, to understand and regulate my passions."[2] In a letter to Sheldon he remarks:

"The sublunary satisfactions that usually whet men's endeavours to attain them are all still below my horizon. I look for none that is attainable, till what is mortal be swallowed up of immortality. I first adjust and blunt my appetites the best I can, and then pinion them before I let them go. So they fly but lamely at their objects; of which I always take severe care beforehand that they be not within the sphere of forbidden things. Thus do I act in all matters as if I had no kind of bias nor other interest than to promote right and virtuous living; excluding from my acting the least grain of the leaven of envy, hatred, malice, or resentment, and never admitting more passion than needs to enliven them. . . . So labour I to keep my integrity and a good conscience by the strength of Him who enables me, and to walk unreprovably so far as my understanding comprehends the right rule of my actings."[3]

Not only did he share, as a Stoic, the Puritan contempt for the things of the world, but the tone of the above quotation, and his frequent references to his Stoicism on quite unnecessary occasions prove that he was not without some of that spiritual pride which the ascetic attitude is apt to engender.[4] Unlike the strict Puritans, however, he did not

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 105; *Supplement*, 43, 465.

[2] *K.P.*, March 23/April 2, 1658.

[3] *Sheldon MSS.* (Bodleian): Dolben Papers, MSS. Add. C, 302, f. 79.

[4] *Cf. Brit. Mus. Add. MSS.*, 15858, f. 81, Letter to Evelyn, Jan. 14, 1668 (Yester); *Balcarres Papers*, Advocates' Lib., IX, f. 157, see *post*, App. D; Huygens, *Corr.*, IV. no. 1013, May 6, 1662; *K.P.*, March 17, 1664; *Diary of Alex. Brodie*, Spalding Club, 1863, 201.

consider Science a worldly pursuit. Besides, he was partly led into the Stoic position by Epictetus,[1] a master whom the Puritans would have disowned. This was but another instance of his Latitudinarianism in relation to sources of opinion.

Although Sir Robert Moray prided himself somewhat on being of the Stoic persuasion, yet he was careful to point out that Christianity was its necessary supplement. In his struggle with his passions he conquers " by the strength of Him who enables me," and " Stoicism " he says, " cannot allay griefs like Grace from on high—a more powerful Philosophy." [2] In this respect he was not consistent, for the disciple of Zeno was a self-sufficient being. But this inconsistency was not peculiar to him, for Charron and Du Vair, two French moralists of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, both of them advocates of the Stoic system, were equally inconsistent. Moreover, it is sufficient to distinguish him from such men as Saint-Evremond and Gassendi, who, as believers in the Epicurean ethics, were examples of the secularist tendency which existed in the seventeenth century, but became much more widespread and powerful in the eighteenth.[3] Thus Moray did not belong wholly to any one of the religious sects of his epoch, nor did he completely typify any single tendency of religious thought. In brief, Charles II., who was a shrewd judge of men, was right when he said of him that he was " head of his own Church." [4]

A consequence of his Stoic tendency was doubtless that " wonted gravity " and that reserve which he mentions as characterising himself.[5] But however reserved he may have been about himself, Moray was one of the friendliest of men. According to Burnet :

" There was nothing of art or form in him, all was simple

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, *Supplement*, 43, 465.

[2] *K.P.*, April 8/18, 1658.

[3] Mariéjol in Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, VI. (ii), 454–5 ; 459–60.

[4] *L.P.*, 23123, f. 157. Rothes to Lauderdale, Aug. 16, 1665.

[5] *K.P.*, Jan. 7 and 10, 1658.

and natural. . . . One thing in him was quite new to me, which was the receiving of all that came unto him with an open and cheerful visage, as if he had known them long, and his talking of indifferent things frankly to them. This was very obliging and took off that restraint of bashfulness that is on modest men." [1]

This was merely a pleasing affability with passing acquaintances, a quality which is often found in conjunction with fundamental selfishness. But Moray had high ideals in relation to real friendship, and his practice answered to those ideals. He considered friendship of greater value than personal profit or glory. When Huygens and Kincardine quarrelled over the division of prospective profits, Sir Robert advised Kincardine to compromise matters with his friend. Huygens might be in error as to his contention, but it would be better to lose money than to break a friendship.[2] Moray was ever opposed to censoriousness.

" Friends are not to be judged, until they are proved to be worthy of it. . . . There is nothing more natural than to err, and nothing more common than to find faults, and it is no less difficult to censure well than to do well." " A body seldom repents of forbearing to condemn people till they have just and true ground." [3]

This charity of disposition was not due to the mental weakness which is blind to faults. " He knew mankind well, and though he never spoke hardly of any man, yet when he gave characters of men to a friend, it appeared he did it with great judgment." [4] Again, it was not the result of moral laxity or moral cowardice. He had an element of sternness in him. " How came you to lay aside that dread of me you

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, *Supplement*, 43–4.

[2] *K.P.*, and Huygens, *Corr.*, *passim*.

[3] *K.P.*, Feb. 19/March 1, March 16/26, 1658.

[4] Burnet, *O.T.*, *Supplement*, 43. Sir Robert Moray speaks on two occasions with what appears an excess of bitterness and harshness about Clarendon. See *ante*, Ch. VII. p. 146, *n.* 1. He had, however, too high an opinion of Hamilton and Argyle (see *ante*, Chs. III. and V.) and of Jermyn (*K.P.*, April 23, 1660).

say you once had ? " is the significant question which he puts to Kincardine in one of his letters.[1] He knew that there were times for frankness of speech.

" It stirs and sets on work one's spirit to be now and a little whet with a challenge, and sometimes one may try the temper of a friend, and the strain of his friendship, with making a little slip, to see how he will take it. And in such cases, to take no notice of that failing may be construed to flow from a little too much phlegm or indifferency."[2]

He can hardly have carried out the practice of frankness in his relations with Charles II., but the relation of a subject to a King is not that of two friends to each other. In any case, the King respected him, and Charles, with all his failings, was impatient with mere pretenders to virtue. There were occasions upon which Moray plainly told defaulters what he thought of their conduct. Kincardine,[3] Jas. Gregory,[4] and Huygens [5] had to undergo his quiet but firm rebuke, yet they remained friendly with him in spite of his reproaches.[6] In this respect they were different from and superior to Lauderdale. Accordingly, one is inclined to believe Burnet when he says of Sir Robert that " he had the plainest, but withal the softest way of reproving, chiefly young people, for their faults, that I ever met with." [7]

But Moray's friendships were fostered by his eagerness to help as well as by his tact and forbearance.

[1] *K.P.*, Jan. 29, 1658.

[2] *Ibid.*, March 19/29, 1658.

[3] *K.P.*, Nov. 5, 1663. Kincardine ought not to have let his quarrel with Bellenden get to the height it is at. He ought to have remembered Bellenden's disposition and " tempered " himself.

[4] Huygens, *Corr.*, VI. no. 1730, April 16, 1669. " Devant que [M. Gregory] partît d'ici, je lui avais dit quelques-uns de mes sentiments touchant son humeur et son procédé " (*i.e.*, towards Huygens) " assez nettement."

[5] *Ibid.*, V. no. 1239. June 24, 1664. " Le style de votre dernière à M. le Comte de Kincardine me plaît fort, et l'autre, pour vous dire franchement, ne m'aurait pas agréé." Also VI. no. 1708, Feb. 5, 1669. Reproaches Huygens with the bitterness of his controversy with Gregory—" Permettez-moi de vous dire franchement ce que je pense de l'aigreur qui en est produite."

[6] *Ibid.*, VII. nos. 1822, 1860, 1866. Prove that Huygens continued to respect Sir Robert even after 1669. *Cf.* Rigaud's *Corr. of Sci. Men in the 17th century*, II. 255. Jas. Gregory to Collins, May 13, 1673.

[7] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 106.

" Be not afraid to load my spirit," he wrote to Kincardine, . . . " a singular piece of friendship lies in compassion. You must not use me so severely as to suffer me to be free when there lies any weight upon you. I assure you my shoulder is ready to help to bear your burdens. This you had reason to know before, but now you must no more pretend ignorance, and either reckon me as much concerned in you as anybody else is, or you are unjust to me."[1]

Both Burnet and Aubrey testify to his readiness to help his fellows. " He had " says the former, " a most diffused love to all mankind, and he delighted in every occasion of doing good, which he managed with great discretion and zeal."[2] " He was a person the most obliging about the Court," writes Aubrey, " and the only man that would do a kindness gratis upon an account of friendship. . . . I know [this] to be true on my own score as well as others."[3] Many of his correspondents were evidently indebted to him for services which he had rendered,[4] and in various letters of the period he is mentioned as having exerted himself in the interests of other people.[5] Sometimes he defended those who were being misrepresented at Court; both Petty and Kincardine had reason to thank him for such a service.[6] This real helpfulness on his part makes one attach less importance to the exaggerated professions of friendship in which he at times indulged. In Moray, this was partly a fashion of the time; it was so undoubtedly in his letters to Mazarin.[7] But he could be effusive even in letters to Kincardine and Boyle, to mention no others, and in those cases it was less excusable.

[1] *K.P.*, Oct. 19/29, 1657.

[2] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 105–6.

[3] Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, II. 81.

[4] *E.g.*, Beale, Ball, Sinclair, Petty, Sorbière. See *Letter Bks. of the Royal Society*, B (1), f. 36, f. 109; P (1), ff. 11, 16, 17, 23, 25, 26, 27; S (1), ff. 8, 24–27.

[5] *Letters of Argyle to Lauderdale*, Ban. Club, 1829, letter of Oct. 16, 1663; Rigaud, *Corr. of Sci. Men in the 17th Century*, I. 201; II. 178, 192, 222, 255; *H.M.C. Reports* VI., *Letters to Slingesby*. App. 336b—338b; Huygens, *Corr.*, V. no. 1363, March 17, 1665.

[6] *K.P.*, Dec. 18, 1665. Also *Letter Bks. of the Royal Society*, P (1), ff. 11–27.

[7] *Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, ff. 231, 233; also 60, f. 252. Letters of Moray to Mazarin.

According to Aubrey, followed by Wood, Sir Robert's kindly feelings extended to men only. "He abhorred women," and the King teased him about this.[1] In reality, there is evidence to show that this statement is an exaggeration. "You never met with such a cold wooer as I," wrote Moray from Maastricht; "since ever I came to this place, I have visited neither male nor female, but two or three cousins, and that never three times." This passage seems to harmonise with Aubrey's remark, but it is not Sir Robert's constant strain. "Pray, how do you pass your free hours," he wrote again to Kincardine, "that you can find a gentlewoman's visit tedious?" On another occasion he boasted that he could discourse at great length on how to find happiness in married life.[2] Moreover, his relations with Lady Balcarres, Lady Margaret Kennedy, and the Duchess of Hamilton were not those of a misogynist,[3] and his solicitude for his niece during her illness was considered excessive by Tweeddale and Lauderdale. It would be pleasant to read into Aubrey's remark an indication that Moray was untouched by the coarseness of the time. But he did not wholly escape it, and in the series to Kincardine there is one letter which contains an extremely gross and sordid story. Fortunately it is the only blemish on an otherwise delightful correspondence.[4]

His active friendliness to individuals was paralleled by the services which he rendered to his native country, of which, according to Aubrey, he was the chief *appui* and the good angel.[5] His career, taken as a whole, is the best proof of his patriotism. It was not, of course, an unsullied one. As a diplomatist and politician, and also as a soldier, he was guilty of various lapses from absolute rectitude. It is unnecessary to refer to them here, for they have not been con-

[1] Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, II. 81.

[2] *K.P.*, March 23/April 2, Jan. 7, Feb. 12/22, 1658.

[3] *Ibid.*, Sept. 12, 1659. Also Lindsay's *Memoirs of Lady Anna Mackenzie passim*. See also *L.P.*, 23128, f. 150, Oct. 24, 1667.

[4] There is another example in Airy, *L.P.*, II. 50, *n.* d.

[5] *Brief Lives*, II. 81.

cealed in the account of his career. But, for the most part, it was that of a high-minded man, and the interest of his country was the dominant motive of his actions. If he joined the Covenanters in 1639,[1] it was probably the national rather than the religious element in their quarrel with Charles which enlisted his sympathy. His attempts to reconcile Charles I. and the Scots in 1646 were doubtless due to the misgiving with which the rise of Independency was regarded in Scotland, partly as a possible menace to its system of Church Government, partly as a danger to the monarchy. Even more certain manifestations of patriotism were his share in the Glencairn Rising, his pleading for moderation at the Restoration, his practice of it in 1667 and 1668, and his final quarrel with the Duke of Lauderdale.

It has been seen that in his nature reserve was compatible with geniality. In the same way the trace of spiritual self-satisfaction which his letters disclose did not exclude an attractive modesty. In Moray's opinion, humility should be the ideal, especially of men of science. Their motive to study ought not to be the desire for personal glory. For this position he urged many reasons. A great discovery is both the will and the gift of God.[2] Moreover, progress in Science implies mutual help, and the aspirant to fame desires to shine by himself.[3] Again, one ought to reflect less on what has been done than upon what remains to be accomplished. Most important of all, the desire for profit or glory leads to undignified disputes and thus diminishes respect for knowledge. At times, however, Moray seems to have recognised that these were counsels of perfection, for there are occasions upon which he stimulates the scientific energy of Huygens by the thought of personal renown.[4] His own practice, on

[1] A. Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, III. 725–26. *Cf. ante*, Ch. I.

[2] Letters to John Winthrop (*Letters of Hartlib, Haak., etc., to J.W.*, Massachusetts Hist. Socy.), Dec. 19, 1665; Monconys, *Voyages de M. de Monconys*, Voyage en Angleterre, 65–66.

[3] *Voyages de Monconys*, 65–66.

[4] Huygens, *Corr.*, III. no. 851, March 23, 1661; V. no. 1421, June 16, 1665.

the other hand, conformed to the maxims which he proclaimed, and Sorbière was delighted with his modesty.

" Je considerai avec admiration l'empressement que ce sage Écossais avait pour avancer la connaissance des choses naturelles, et les commodités de la vie que la mécanique peut tirer de cette science. Certes, la familiarité avec laquelle il en usait me faisait avoir beaucoup plus de respect pour lui que s'il se fût étudié de cacher son ignorance sous le masque de je ne sais quelle gravité." [1]

This humility was only a practical example of that superiority to earthly ambitions which he considered to be the highest virtue. As one whose affections were set on eternal things he was also " free from covetousness as a Carthusian." [2] Yet it is possible that he practised this excellence to excess. At any rate, whether he was to blame for it or not, he was often in debt. No doubt his pay from the French Government was greatly in arrears, and his monetary straits while in exile were partly due to that fact, and partly to the confiscations which he suffered as a Royalist in 1655.[3] His poverty continued, however, after the Restoration, and he died poor.[4] It cannot be positively said that he was careless in money matters, for there is not enough evidence to justify such an assertion. But it is relevant to point out that not a few of the devotees of experimental knowledge ruined themselves financially by their scientific zeal.[5]

In spite of Moray's faults of character and notwithstanding the blemishes on his career, one does not feel inclined to quarrel seriously with Burnet's verdict upon him. To say that he was the " worthiest man of the age " [6] is merely an instance of that praise in the superlative degree to which Burnet was prone, and which he bestowed equally upon

[1] S. Sorbière, *Relation d'un Voyage en Angleterre*, Paris, 1664, 75.

[2] Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, II. 81.

[3] *Cf. ante*, Ch. V. Also *K.P.*, Dec. 18, 1658.

[4] *Cf.* Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, II. 81.

[5] *Cf.* Sorbière, *Relation etc.*, 78. Also Mariéjol in Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, VI. (ii), 472.

[6] Burnet, *O.T.*, II. 25.

Leighton and Kincardine. That he was " the most universally beloved and esteemed by men of all sides and sorts of any man I have ever known in my whole life," also savours of exaggeration.[1] Burnet, of course, made the acquaintance of Sir Robert only after the Restoration, when most of the events of his career to which critics might point were past and forgotten. Most of those who had distrusted him—Charles I., Montereul, Graymond, and Clarendon—were dead or abroad. After 1660 he was esteemed as a man of science, courted as a friend of the Sovereign,[2] and, owing to his moderation in Scotland, a comparative favourite even among Presbyterians.[3] One must, therefore, remember the circumstances in which Burnet and Moray were known to each other. Nevertheless, it remains true that Sir Robert was very generally " beloved and esteemed by men of all sides and sorts." [4]

The love was for his character, the esteem for his gifts as well. His intellectual interests were chiefly, but not solely, of a scientific nature. It was not the custom of the scientific men of that age to limit themselves to one subject, such as Chemistry or Physiology ; the tendency was towards universality of knowledge. Naturally, different individuals had different preferences. Some studied the mathematico-physical sciences rather than those of observation, the natural sciences ; and, within these two general groups, there were more particular preferences.

Fortunately, Sir Robert himself states what was his favourite subject of study. On the 1st of August, 1661, Huygens had written to him, giving an account of his recent undertakings. He had been busy over the application of Algebra to the Theory of Music, and with an inquiry into Logarithms. But, he adds, " vous faites peu de compte de

[1] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 188–90 ; 240–1, 105.

[2] Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, II. 81.

[3] Airy, *L.P.*, App., J. Sharp to Sheldon, June 14, 1668.

[4] Among his admirers were such men as Sharp and Sheldon, Baxter and Wodrow, Lauderdale, Pepys, and Charles II., Aubrey, Evelyn, Huygens, Winthrop, Kincardine, Gregory, and Collins.

ces choses, étant tout à fait dans l'étude de la Physique." A week later Moray wrote in reply : " Il est vrai que pour mon particulier, j'aime bien mieux les spéculations de la physique que toute autre sorte d'étude. Mais il est juste que les Sciences Mathématiques tiennent le second lieu. Et, de fait, j'y suis aussi fort porté, mais je n'ai pas la commodité de m'y appliquer en façon quelconque." [1]

Even outside the realm of the mathematico-physical sciences Moray's knowledge was extensive. He appears to have been attracted by Chemistry more than by any other of the natural sciences. At Maastricht he had a small laboratory, and after the Restoration he became one of the operators in the Whitehall laboratory.[2] During the seventeenth century, the chief acquisitions to chemical knowledge were made in connection with metallurgy and with pharmaceutical preparations.[3] Moray's correspondence makes it clear that he was interested in both of these subjects. On the 19th of December, 1665, writing to Winthrop, he said :

" I am at this very time with the King's allowance retired from Court for a time to amuse myself in a private place, where I am about some chemical experiments, intending to bestow some trials upon some improvements that may collaterally take in others : the one to extract from lead ore all the metal it contains with one wash(?), great ease, and small charge ; the other to do the same in extracting silver out of lead with the same advantages, when the lead holds so much as may be worth the pains. I do not promise myself great success ; but I am sure it would be of great use, if it pleased God I lighted upon the way of doing it ; and I am the more ready to apply myself to this, that I am in a fair way to engage myself and

[1] Huygens, *Corr.*, III. nos. 881 and 884. Aubrey and Wood state that he was a good chemist, Wood and Kirkton that he was an eminent mathematician. Burnet denies that he had a deep knowledge of mathematics. Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, II. 81 ; Wood, *Ath. Oxon.*, III. 725–6 ; Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 105 ; Kirkton, *Secret and True Hist. of the Church of Scot.*, 260.

[2] His rooms in Whitehall were contiguous to the laboratory, and looked out upon the Privy Gardens. This is clear from a plan of Whitehall in Kensington Palace (date of the plan, 1679). Huygens' letters to him were addressed frequently to Sir R. Moray, " du coste du jardin, Whitehall."

[3] Tannery in Lavisse et Rambaud, *Hist. Gén.*, VI. 419–420.

some of my friends in the silver mines, as they call them, in Cardiganshire, in Wales, which have formerly yielded much silver, and lie now under water, which is to be taken off with adits that are now carrying up to the mines." [1]

The "trials" which he undertook were attended with considerable success,[2] but, although he visited Wales he did not stay there long. "I am like to meddle not in those mine matters. For, if I should, I must be among them 18 or 20 months or more before they can be settled, and I do not find after two attempts, very serious, that the King will permit me to go from him, at least for so long a time as is necessary." [3]

As to medical remedies chemically prepared, Moray wrote from time to time to Kincardine, while the latter was suffering from ague at Bremen. On one of those occasions, he wrote: "There is a renowned chemist called Glauberus, that hath found out of Antimony that is one of the soverainest remedies in the world, if it be true he writes of it. Pray inquire at your physicians if they know him and his powder. It is quite another way of preparation than ever anybody lighted on, unless it were Paracelsus. I have his books and his grains of his powder." [4]

It is chiefly owing to Kincardine's illness that we learn of Moray's interest in medical science. Indeed, the disease of his friend very largely directed his attention to medical matters.[5] "I tell you, you have made me much more of a Doctor than I was before." [6] Earlier, he had written: "All my physical skill, I mean in the medical sphere, is not else but the effect of loose ratiocination built upon no great stock of knowledge of natural things." [7] That the

[1] *Letters of Hartlib, Haak, etc., to John Winthrop*, 23–27.

[2] *H.M.C. Reports*, VI. *Letters to Slingesby*, April 9, 1666, 336b–338b.

[3] *K.P.*, July 3, 1666.

[4] *Ibid.*, Oct. 19/29, 1657.

[5] Not wholly, for in *K.P.*, Jan. 3, 1658, he says: "I was as long at the anatomy school as the chemical."

[6] *K.P.*, March 16/26, 1658.

[7] *K.P.*, Jan. 10, 1658.

stock increased very considerably is proved by his acquaintance with the works of Van Helmont, and probably also of Borelli.[1] Borelli (1608–1679) was the promoter of Iatromechanism, one of the two dominant systems of medical thought in the seventeenth century. He tried to apply mathematics and mechanics to the phenomena of life. Thus he recommended the use of the thermometer, and he made an apparatus to observe the pulse by the aid of the pendulum.[2] Perhaps it was of such an apparatus that Moray wrote to his friend on the 12th of April, 1658: "Yesterday I made an instrument to measure pulses as accurately as you can measure the parts of an inch."[3] The other school of thought was dominated by chemical conceptions, and Van Helmont (1577–1644) was one of the earlier leaders in it.[4]

Botany and Zoology made comparatively small progress during the seventeenth century,[5] and they would seem to have been the sciences in which Sir Robert interested himself least.[6] Still, in Zoology, he knew the work of Aldrovandus, of which he had not a very high opinion.[7] He was acquainted with gardening books, and he could give advice as to where flower-seeds were to be had in the greatest variety.[8]

This tendency to universality of knowledge is perhaps the most distinctive trait of scientific men during the seventeenth century. But, curiously enough, they combined with this enthusiasm for knowledge as such, a keen interest in the practical applications of Science, and they felt certain that the conditions of life would be greatly improved through its

[1] *K.P.*, March 11/21, April 12, 1658.

[2] Tannery in Lavisse et Rambaud, *Hist. Gén.*, V. 466–7; VI. 423–4.

[3] *K.P.*, April 12, 1658.

[4] Tannery in Lavisse et Rambaud, *Hist. Gén.*, VI. 423–4; V. 466–7.

[5] Tannery in *op. cit.*, V. 461–64; VI. 424–427.

[6] At any rate, in his letters to Kincardine he does not refer very frequently to them, nor did he often allude to them in his remarks at the R.S. meetings (see *Journal Books*, I–V; *cf.* also *Register Books* and *Guard Books* for subjects of his Papers).

[7] *K.P.*, June 15/25, 1658. For Aldrovandus' value, see Lavisse et Rambaud, V. 464. M. Tannery does not rate it very high.

[8] *K.P.*, Nov. 27/Dec. 7, 1657, March 23/April 2, 1658.

agency.[1] Hence their enthusiasm for mechanical inventions and the eagerness with which they heard about methods of industry.[2]

Moray's scientific correspondence and his remarks in debate at the meetings of the Royal Society sufficiently demonstrate that the practical aspect of science appealed strongly to him. Partly, no doubt, this was because he was not merely a student, but in touch with the politics of an impoverished country. He was particularly interested in the invention of Huygens and Kincardine, whereby pendulum clocks could be used and longitudes ascertained at sea.[3] Improvements in ship-building,[4] and especially in the equipment for divers,[5] attracted his attention, while Graunt's book on the Bills of Mortality profoundly impressed him.[6] While he was in Holland, he wrote to Kincardine about new methods of economising the consumption of coal. "It is a kind of baking of coals that you would not for a groat were known in Scotland, for it makes them last much longer and burn much better." . . "There is another new trick in Holland which will save the brewers, I think, two parts in three of their coals. How do you like that?"[7]

His knowledge of trades and industrial processes and his capacity to give practical advice were quite remarkable.[8] He wrote a History of Masonry, and he could have written

[1] Tannery in *op. cit.*, V. 459–60, 488. Bacon and Descartes were very hopeful as to its beneficial effects.

[2] Sprat, 257–9, "Histories of Trades," etc.

[3] *Cf.* Corr. with Huygens and Kincardine, *passim*.

[4] *R.S. Letter Books*, P(1) ff. 11–27. Huygens, *Corr.*, IV. no. 1093; IV. no. 1102.

[5] Huygens, *Corr.*, V. no. 1240; *R.S. Journal Bk.* II. March 16, 1664; *R.S. Register Bk.* III. f. 20. Notes concerning Diving.

[6] Huygens, *Corr.*, IV. no. 1013. May 6, 1662. Moray to Huygens. "Si l'on tenait compte, dans toutes les villes de l'Europe, des maladies dont on meurt, avec les autres choses qui s'observent dans les Weekly Bills of Mortality, qui se font depuis plusieurs années à Londres, et qu'il s'y adjoustât d'autres remarques qu'on tâchera de faire observer ici . . ce serait une chose de grande utilité en plusieurs égards."

[7] *K.P.*, Dec. 7, 1657. Kincardine had coal-mines on his estate at Culross.

[8] *Cf. R.S. Journal Books*, I–V. *passim*. Remarks at meetings.

that of other trades as well. "As to inventions for salt-making," he informs Kincardine, "when you and I meet, you shall find I know something of that trade too. . . . As to sparing of fuel in salt-making, I can entertain you sufficiently on that theme." On another occasion he advises his friend as to the proper form and substance of water-pipes. He states what should be the size of the bore. Elms are very dear at London owing to the demand for them there. Oak would serve his purpose. An elm of 18 inches is stronger than a fir of 24 inches. Fir, however, has no knots, and it does not readily crack. Much depends on the clearness or muddiness of the water which they are to carry, and also on the nature of the soil in which the pipes are to be laid. In some soils elm is better than fir. There are a hundred things to say on such a topic. Similarly he would discourse on the stocking of fish-ponds.[1] He seems to have informed himself carefully about the fishing trade.[2] Charles II. had enjoyed some herring sent by the Earl of Argyle, and, through Sir Robert, he requested that more might be sent. After acquainting Argyle of the King's wish, Moray gave him a minute account of the best means for preserving herring.[3]

While the utilitarian aspect of Science began to be adequately recognised during the seventeenth century, the same epoch saw the gradual disappearance of false sciences and of popular superstitions.[4] Nevertheless, shortly before 1660, Moray certainly believed in Astrology. "Another property of the stars" he wrote, "is the secret power they have over inferior things and the operations they exert upon them by their influence, which, how noble or potent soever it be, is not at all or but little obnoxious to sense, and even but so little perceptible to reason in most of them, as even our astrologers have not yet attained to deep knowledge in them." [5] He had

[1] *K.P.*, Dec. 1657, Jan. 1658.

[2] *Ibid.*, April 26, 1670.

[3] *H.M.C. Reports*, VI. *Argyle MSS.* Letter from Moray to Argyle, 622a.

[4] That is, so far as men of science were concerned; *cf.* W. H. E Lecky, *Rationalism in Europe*, 1910 edn., I. 113–138.

[5] *K.P.*, Feb. 4/14, 1658.

not changed his views by December, 1665.[1] On the other hand he did not believe in Alchemy. Wood, it is true, asserts that " he was a great patron of the Rosicrucians " ; [2] but this is a gross exaggeration of the truth. The only Rosicrucian whom he is known to have patronised was Thomas Vaughan, the brother of Henry Vaughan, the Silurist.[3] The relationship between the two men did not necessarily imply community of ideas. The author of the *Sceptical Chemist* was assuredly not an alchemist, and yet Boyle in 1659 brought to Oxford a certain Peter Sthael who was a Rosicrucian.[4] But the correspondence between Huygens and Moray puts the matter beyond doubt. On the 9th of October, 1661, Moray wrote of Boyle's *Sceptical Chemist* that it was " une des plus jolies et des plus hardies pièces qu'il a encore publiées." Huygens expressed a high opinion of the work, and Sir Robert replied : " Votre opinion du *Chymiste Sceptique* est celle même de tous ceux qui en savent juger." [5]

Such were Moray's relations to Astrology and Alchemy. With regard to various popular superstitions he was uncertain in his attitude. On the 29th of June, 1664, he proposed in the Royal Society " that it might be examined what truth there is in that received tradition that the stainings of fruits will not wash out the same year that they are made, but will the next spring at the time of their blossoming, which when passed, they cannot be washed out that year neither." [6]

[1] *Letters of Hartlib, Haak, etc. to J. Winthrop*, Letter of Dec. 19, 1665, 23–27.

[2] Wood, *Ath. Oxon.*, III. 725–26.

[3] T. Vaughan died at Albery near Oxford of gas poisoning, Feb. 27, 1666. Sir R. Moray buried him. H. Vaughan in a poem commemorating the event says :

> " . . . the *Isis* and the prouder *Thames*,
> Can shew his reliques lodg'd hard by their streams,
> And must for ever to the honour'd name
> Of Noble *Murrey* chiefly owe that fame".

The Works of Henry Vaughan, ed. L. C. Martin, 1914, II. 659. Vaughan informed Aubrey that his brother Thomas gave to " Sr Robert Murrey (his great friend) . . . all his bookes & manuscripts." *Ibid.*, II. 667.

[4] C. Wren, *Parentalia*, London, folio 1750, 213, 559.

[5] Huygens, *Corr.*, III. no. 909, Oct. 9, 1661 ; IV. no. 964, Jan. 24, 1662.

[6] *R.S. Journal Bks.*, II. June 29, 1664.

Again, although he was very sceptical as to the reality of the cures wrought by Valentine Greatrix, the stroker, yet he was not willing to deny that they might be genuine.[1] In thus retaining certain absurd beliefs, Moray did not stand alone among the scientific men of the century. Kepler had believed in astrology,[2] and Cassini believed in it during the early part of his career.[3] Witchcraft found a defender in Joseph Glanvil,[4] while Boyle was satisfied that Greatrix was not a charlatan.[5] The Royal Society, as a whole, saw nothing ridiculous in that proposal of Sir Robert which has just been mentioned, and some of the members believed in the cosmetic virtues of May dew.[6]

The Physical Sciences are not the only subjects of human knowledge the study of which satisfies the rational rather than the aesthetic faculty in man. Philosophy and Theology are other results of the same mental tendency to unify the facts of experience. As a member of the Royal Society, Moray could not study Theology, but as a private individual he was not unacquainted with the theological works of his age. He recommends to Kincardine the writings of Jo. Drusius and Sextinus Amoma. They are good as critical books on Scripture Language. He prefers them to those of other scholars. Both men are great masters of the Oriental tongues, chiefly the Jewish writings. Drusius has diverse volumes of notes on some books of the Old Testament, and on the Syriac translation of the New Testament. The work of Amoma he knows more superficially. His design was to vindicate the text from all misinterpretations, which he does handsomely so far as he goes.[7] Somewhat later he brought to the notice of his friend " all the works of Calixtus, a learned

[1] *H.M.C. Reports*, VI. *Letters to Slingesby*, April 9, 1666, 336b–338b.

[2] Tannery in Lavisse et Rambaud, *Hist. Gén.* V. 480.

[3] L. Maury, *Les Académies d'Autrefois*, I. 22. Cassini was an Italian astronomer, who came to work in the new Observatoire in Paris.

[4] W. H. E. Lecky, *Rise of Rationalism in Europe*, 1910 edn., I. 103–138.

[5] C. R. Weld, *History of the Royal Society*, I. 90–91.

[6] Weld, *op. cit.*, I. 38, 92.

[7] *K.P.*, April 8/18, 1658.

and moderate Lutheran, lately dead." [1] It may be noted that, according to Principal Tulloch, Calixtus was the only theologian of merit in Germany during the seventeenth century.[2]

In spite of his many scientific interests, Sir Robert found time to cultivate the arts. In his youth he was " extrêmement adonné à la musique, tant la théorie que la pratique." But, he adds, writing in 1661, " pendant vingt ans de distraction, ma passion s'est un peu ralentie." [3] It has been seen that during his sojourn in Maastricht he deliberately refrained from musical practice, vowing that he would only resume it with the advent of happier days. After the Restoration he probably did so, for Pepys says of him that " he understood the doctrine of music and everything else I could discourse of very finely." [4]

There is little trace in his correspondence of an acquaintance with or a love for pure literature. From a passage in a letter to Kincardine, it may be surmised that he had read Tasso and Ariosto,[5] and during the winter in the Highlands after Middleton's defeat by English troops, he spent part of his time in the perusal of Pastorals.[6] It would be dangerous to press the argument from silence, however, and there is no doubt that he himself had considerable gifts of style.

It will be clear from the foregoing pages that Moray was a man of his time, not only in the wide scope of his interests, but also in the largely utilitarian view of Science which he held. Naturally the Letters and Papers which he wrote as well as the contributions which he made to the debates in Gresham College reveal more individual aspects of his mental

[1] *Ibid.*, April 15/25, 1658.

[2] J. Tulloch, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England during the 17th Century*, I. 8.

[3] Huygens, *Corr.*, III. no. 884, Aug. 9, 1661.

[4] Pepys, *Diary* (Feb. 16, 1667), ed. H. B. Wheatley, VI. 179.

[5] *K.P.*, Jan. 10, 1658.

[6] *H.M.C. Reports* XI., Pt. VI; *Hamilton Papers*, Letters of Moray (1654–56), 138.

nature. What is specially distinctive about him is an entire absence of pedantry. A pedant cannot be humorous at his own expense, and Sir Robert is frequently so.

" My learned pen hath learnt by long practice to write alone, whether it hath subject given it or not. For if you look narrowly to all flows from it, you will find now and then some cause to think it might have writ as good sense in the wing that bred it as in the hand that guides it." [1]

He does not take himself too seriously, and thus he is not ashamed to admit ignorance. " I am such a master as love to learn the very alphabets of things I need without blushing." On the other hand, he is " very little for implicit deference to mortals," [2] and he does not hesitate to criticise the theories of even the most eminent men when he thinks that he has sufficient cause.[3] This combination of modesty and independence implies great mental balance, which is not often, indeed is seldom, the mark of enthusiasts. Yet Sir Robert certainly was an enthusiast. The records of his intellectual activities give the impression of a man who was extraordinarily alert and of boundless curiosity, who sought and obtained information on every occasion and by every means—from books and things, from converse and correspondence.

Burnet, reflecting upon his qualities, compared Sir Robert Moray to Peiresc. " He had a genius much like Peiresc's as he is described by Gassendi." [4] Peiresc, indeed, was the most striking example in Europe of the tendency to universality in knowledge. It was thus not unnatural to compare with him any virtuoso who exhibited the same tendency in a less degree. Evelyn, for instance, was honoured in this fashion.[5] Perhaps it was in this superficial and general way

[1] *K.P.*, April 2, 1658.

[2] *K.P.*, Jan. 12/22, April 16/26, 1658.

[3] Huygens, *Corr.*, III. no. 869, June 21, 1661 ; IV. no. 1055, Aug. 22, 1662.

[4] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 105–6. See Jean Baptiste Requier, *Vie de Peiresc* (d'après Gassendi), Paris, 1770, especially the last forty pages. Gassendi's work (in Latin) was published at Paris in 1641.

[5] Evelyn, *Diary*, ed. H. Wheatley, I. xxxviii–xxxix.

that Burnet intended the comparison to be taken. A more fitting appreciation is that of Wodrow, which agrees with Evelyn's :[1] he was " a very learned and ingenious gentleman, a great ornament of his country."

[1] Wodrow, I. 274. Yet Wodrow did not appreciate Moray's work in science so much as Burnet did. Evelyn, *op. cit.*, II. 292–3.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

In one of his letters to Kincardine Sir Robert Moray mentions that his motto for his coat-of-arms is "*esse quam videri.*" It is appropriate to the star which he has chosen as his crest. For the stars which to our vision appear to be the smallest may be in reality the greatest and most brilliant. Stars, also, have a subtle, insensible influence upon the affairs of men. In like manner he too would rather be something than appear to be so. He is careful to point out that his motto is not "*esse et non videri.*" "One may desire to be somewhat and not be known, and yet content to be known when it requires." [1] This motto sounds like a prophecy of the fate of his reputation with posterity. The study of Moray's achievements and characteristics inevitably suggests the problem why a career and a personality of such interest have so largely escaped notice. The very fact that they have done so seems a considerable argument against attaching much importance to them. One is inclined to conclude that he was an able man of varied interests and manifold activities, who attempted too much and effected little, and whose comparative obscurity has been the natural sequel to his mode of life.

Moreover, the question may be asked whether Moray's reputation would have been greater had he restricted his energies to one sphere. That he was not by nature fitted to be great either as a soldier or as a statesman is proved by his own dislike of both occupations. Again, if he had devoted

[1] *K.P.*, Feb. 4/14, 1658.

himself wholly to Science, Sir Robert would not have risen to the front rank; his talents were great, but he was not a scientific genius. Without other occupations, he would, with the gifts that he possessed, have accomplished much more than he did in the scientific field. Nevertheless, he would probably have been even less well known; for in science even more than in literature, first-rate excellence is the only guarantee of a permanent reputation. Had Moray been a recluse, he would scarcely have had the arresting character which, as much as anything else, has kept his reputation alive, and which the varying circumstances of an active life must have tended to produce.

If, then, Moray's comparative obscurity is his due, it is not because of the variety which marked his life. In point of fact, he deserved to be better known than he has been, and it is not difficult to explain why he has been less well known than he merited. Most of our knowledge about Moray is to be found in political or scientific correspondence, recently printed or not printed even yet. There are at least fourteen writers of the seventeenth century and one of the early eighteenth, some of them English, the others Scottish, who, taken together, provide a considerable amount of information about the man and his activities. Unfortunately for Moray's reputation, the works of more than half of those writers were not published until the nineteenth century.[1] Moreover, the total amount of information contained in these sources is not so great as one might have expected. Why is this? And why do writers like Baillie and Guthrie make no mention of him whatever?

Before 1660 the most important transactions in which

[1] This is true of Patrick Gordon, Anne Halkett; Turner, Mackenzie, Kirkton, Row; Pepys, Evelyn, and Aubrey. The others who mention him and whose works were published late in the seventeenth or early in the eighteenth century are: Wodrow, Burnet (*Own Time*, *Lives of the Hamiltons*); Clarendon, Baxter, Sprat, and Wood.

Moray was certainly concerned were those of a diplomatic nature during 1645 and 1646,[1] and those in which he was engaged as an officer in the French army, first on the Continent and then in Scotland. His work as a diplomatist was so important that it was accomplished in great secrecy. For this reason, Baillie,[2] Guthrie and Gordon would not know much, if anything, about it. Hence they did not refer to it, although they deal with the events of the two years during which it was carried through. Clarendon and Burnet probably knew a great deal. But the latter in his *Lives of the Hamiltons* did not wish to compromise the Scots in connection with the coming of the King to their army. Moreover, the work was submitted to Moray's inspection before its publication.[3] Clarendon mentions that Sir Robert took part in the negotiations of 1645–1646, but he does not enter into detail; his information was perhaps too indefinite, and his account of the negotiations as a whole is rather summary.

Moray's activities as an officer in the French army were part of a very interesting aspect of Scottish history, but it was an aspect which did not interest the majority of historical writers in Scotland at that time. To them the struggle of the Kirk with the Crown was not only the chief, but practically the sole, phase of the national history. On the other hand, it is certainly curious that Sir Thomas Urquhart, in his *Discovery of A Most Excellent Jewel*, does not even mention Sir Robert in his list of Scots who served as Colonels under Louis XIII. He mentions others who were of less importance.[4]

[1] It is not certain that he was an agent of Richelieu in 1639. (See *ante*, Ch. I.)

[2] Baillie (*Letters and Journals*, II. 341, 352–3, 365–8) is very indignant at the suggestion that the Scottish Commissioners in London are dealing with the King. (Letters of Jan. 20, Feb. 20, April 23, April 24, 1646.)

[3] Burnet, *O.T.*, I. 41; II. 25, *n.*; *Lives of the Hamiltons* (1852 edn.), xviii. See the present writer's note on "Sir Robert Moray and the *Lives of the Hamiltons*" in the *Scot. Hist. Rev.* X. 438–40.

[4] Pp. 71, 285–287. Published in 1652. He mentions, for example, Irvine, Fullerton, Erskine, Gray.

After the Restoration, the chief interest of Moray's career lies in his administration of Scotland during 1667 and 1668, and in his connection with the scientific development of the time. It is only the Scottish writers who are concerned with the former, but they provide a good deal of information about it. Mackenzie, indeed, does not, but that is owing to the gap in his *Memoirs* from 1663 to 1669. With the exception of Burnet, however, they do not say much about the other question partly because of the nature and scope of their writings,[1] partly because they did not see the significance of the work of the Royal Society. Men like Wodrow, Kirkton, and Row could not perceive that its labours were more important than the struggle between the Kirk and the Crown. Nor could they understand that his character was nobler than that of the fearless zealots whom they eulogised. Burnet, on the contrary, was writing, not the history of Scotland merely, but that of England as well. He could appreciate both the character and the scientific abilities and work of Sir Robert, so that, about these matters, we learn more from him than from any other writer. Burnet, however, was so lavish in his praise that he partly frustrated his own purpose. Thus we find Bevil Higgons remarking:

"He entertains us with a most wonderful character of Bishop Leighton, as he has done in another place with that of Sir Robert Moray: of both which persons, he gives us ideas which seem a little romantic. . . . But it is a pity to spoil these imaginary pieces; so I will only congratulate our island in having the honour to produce two such extraordinary persons; who, in one respect, are a little unfortunate to fall into no better hands, and have such egregious virtues transmitted to posterity by no other pen but that of our author, who happens to stand so ill in the opinion of the world, as to be ranked with one sort of men, who are never believed, even when they speak the truth." [2]

[1] This would be the sole cause in the case of Mackenzie.

[2] Bevil Higgons, *Hist. and Crit. Remarks on Bp. Burnet's History*, London, 1725, 134.

Of the seven English writers who mention Moray, five refer to his connection with Science, but they hardly do more than allude to it. Aubrey could not say much because his purpose was to write *Brief Lives*; Wood's biographical notice is largely borrowed from Aubrey. To Evelyn and Pepys, Sir Robert would be only one of the numerous "virtuosi" of the period. One might have expected a considerable number of references to Moray in Sprat's *History of the Royal Society*, but Sprat deliberately refrained from estimating the relative part of the most notable Fellows in the foundation of the Royal Society and in the carrying on of its work.[1] Thus it can be truly said that Moray's achievements and character have not been properly appreciated, and that his place in the national history has not been adequately recognised.

His life falls completely within the period between the Union of the Crowns and the Revolution. There were many Scotsmen who, during that epoch, showed more genius in one capacity than did Moray. In Literature there were Drummond, Urquhart, Leighton, and Baillie. Eminent in Science were such men as Alexander Anderson, Robert Morison, and James Gregory.[2] In the ranks of the nobility were to be found the chief statesmen—Loudoun, Argyle, and Lauderdale; while Sir William Lockhart was famous as a diplomatist. Men with decided military gifts were numerous, but perhaps the most illustrious were Montrose, Leven, Leslie, Hepburn, Claverhouse, and Turner. In Law, Mackenzie and Dalrymple are great names, and Wm. and John Forbes, Henderson, Baillie, and Leighton were conspicuous among ecclesiastics.[3] But not one of those mentioned played a part of considerable magnitude in so many

[1] Sprat, 311–19.

[2] Anderson, Morison, and Gregory made original contributions to Science.

[3] It is sometimes difficult to say whether a particular name ought or ought not to be included as belonging to the period between 1603 and 1689. Drum-

spheres as did Moray, the soldier, statesman, and man of science. Some of the statesmen of the century were soldiers as well, but largely this was forced upon them by their political position. No one was less of a soldier by temperament than Argyle. There were leading churchmen who were also men of letters, but in their literary efforts they are still churchmen. Leighton's works, for example, are of a religious nature. Baillie was an historian as well as a theological controversialist, but his chief interest in the period which his *Letters and Journals* helps to illuminate is in the fortunes of the Church in its struggle with the King. Mackenzie, famous as a legal writer and practitioner, left, apart from his *Memoirs*, nothing of real value in literature. Montrose wrote poetry and Turner prose, but their military importance was out of all proportion to their accomplishment as writers. Moray's threefold activities are all of importance, and he does not appear in one capacity because he figures in another. He is a soldier by profession, not as a consequence of a political position. His Politics and Science are distinct though related interests.

In regard to character, perhaps no other Scotsman of the period is so noteworthy. It is true that he did not wholly escape the coarseness of the times in which he lived. He had not that complete purity of mind which is the mark of Leighton. But Leighton lacked his robustness of character which only an active life can produce. He was not so uncompromising as Cameron and Henderson, but then he had a breadth, a tolerance, and a charity which they did not possess. He was courageous like Montrose, and he was on the whole modest, as Montrose the soldier, and Morison and Gregory

mond, Henderson, Wm. and John Forbes, Alexander Anderson were all born between 1580 and 1595, but their public careers fall wholly within the epoch under consideration. The same cannot be said of Patrick Forbes, Spottiswoode, and Napier at the one end of the century, nor of Sibbald, Pitcairne, and Burnet at the other.

the men of science, were not. Above all, he had a calm mastery of himself and a resultant sanity which was absent from the intense spirituality of Leighton, from the rigorous idealism of the Covenanters, and from the violence of their persecutors.

Moray has, however, an importance not only in relation to his own time but also in reference to the great age that was to follow—the "Age of Secular Interests."[1] During the eighteenth century Scotland, by its productions in pure literature, as well as in philosophy and science, attracted the attention of cultured Europe. Mr. Andrew Lang hails Mackenzie as a forerunner of the literary Renaissance.[2] As to Philosophy and Science, there is no question of a Renaissance, for they can hardly be said to have existed in Scotland before the eighteenth century. There were individual Scots, like Napier and Alexander Anderson, who did brilliant work in Science. But they were isolated thinkers, one in Scotland, the other in France, and they were separated by more than two generations from the eighteenth century philosophers and men of science whose total achievement constitutes a movement. The beginnings of this movement are naturally to be sought before the commencement of the period to which it imparts a distinctive character. Sir Robert Moray, Morison, and, in less degree, Kincardine are the most conspicuous and the earliest heralds of the new time. They must have influenced the younger men in Scotland and helped to turn their thoughts in a fresh direction. Moray, both as first President of the Royal Society and as a well-known political figure, would attract attention even more than a retired scholar like Morison. It is certain that he interested himself in James Gregory; and Sir Robert Sibbald, in his *Autobiography*, remarks: "Patrick Drummond some time lodged at Court with Sir Robert Moray, the famous virtuoso, and acquainted me with the curious experiments made by

[1] P. Hume Brown, *History of Scotland*, 1909 edn., III.

[2] A. Lang, *Life of Sir George Mackenzie*, 312–313.

him."[1] In this passage he is referring to a time when he was not much above twenty years of age. With Pitcairne and David Gregory, Sibbald illustrates the new tendency, and when they in turn disappear from the scene, the development is nearing its stage of maturity.

Thus, in one respect, Sir Robert is of importance in relation to the future, and, so far, he is of the future. In two ways he is decidedly of his own time: he was an example of the "Scot Abroad," and he was essentially religious. There were numerous "Scots Abroad," as scholars or as soldiers, even before the seventeenth century; but that century, by its conditions, tended to produce new examples of the class. Men went abroad to live the student's life because the Scotland which they knew was not the most favourable place for such a life. Except during the civil wars, there was not a sufficient opportunity at home for those whom a military career attracted. On the other hand, the eighteenth century was to see Scotland itself an intellectual centre, which made it natural that scholarly men should settle in their own country, which indeed implied that they were doing so. In regard to the military career, the eighteenth century made it both less necessary and less possible abroad. England was frequently at war with foreign states, and France, the chief enemy, had nationalised her army. Hence, as a "Scot Abroad," Moray was not of the eighteenth century but of the seventeenth.[2]

After all, however, this is of minor significance. Sir Robert served on the Continent only during his youth, and the "Scot Abroad" movement was a side issue in the national history. Seventeenth century Scotland was dominated by the religious interest, and religion was Moray's governing principle throughout his life. It is true that the interest in

[1] Sibbald's *Autobiography* in J. Maidment's *Analecta Scotica*, 2 vols. Edin. 1834–7, pp. 134–5. *Cf.* Rigaud's *Corr. of Scientific Men in the 17th Century*, Oxford 1841, II. 192, 222, 255; Huygens, *Corr.*, IV. no. 1106.

[2] There were of course Jacobite Scots abroad after 1689, but that was a different matter from the older tendency to seek a livelihood on the Continent owing to the poverty and faction at home. Generally speaking, the statement in the text is correct. *Cf.* J. Hill Burton, *The Scot Abroad.*

the mere externals of religion occupied a very large place in the national mind, and that Sir Robert cared little or nothing for such matters. Nevertheless, the struggle about Presbyterianism would not have occurred had not religion in its deepest sense been of importance to those who engaged in the conflict. The conflict, indeed, was the result of an obsession as to religion. For Moray also the important things in religion were a dynamic fact, but with him they were not an obsession. Moreover, his attitude to the miraculous element in Christianity was one of belief. He had affinities with the Latitudinarians, but it must be remembered that they were as orthodox in regard to fundamentals as the Calvinistic Presbyterians.

The eighteenth century in Scotland was one of achievements in Literature, Philosophy, and Science, and Moray belonged in part to that age. But its attitude to Christianity was hostile or indifferent. At the most, it accommodated Christianity to itself rather than itself to Christianity. The Scotland of the seventeenth century, on the other hand, cared little for Science and Literature; it considered them useless or dangerous. But it was extremely interested in religion. Sir Robert Moray, therefore, more than the many churchmen and the few men of science of his time, more than any other Scotsman of his epoch, typifies the best and dominant tendencies of two eras during the transition period between them.

APPENDIX A

MS. SOURCES

MUCH information regarding Moray's life and character is to be found in Manuscripts.

Those relating to his career in the French army are, almost entirely, in the archives of Paris. In the Archives des Affaires Étrangères, volumes 48 and 49 of the despatches of French Ambassadors in England reveal the course of the negotiations which preceded the establishment of the new regiment of the Scottish Guards. The information which they supply has never yet been published; and, although there is no mention of Moray in these documents, they deal with the origin of the regiment of which he became, first Lieut.-Colonel, and then Colonel.

Certain documents in the Dépôt de la Guerre also relate to the raising of the Regiment. Volume 14 (expéditions, 1631–1633), for example, contains the capitulation signed on March 6, 1633, by Sir John Hepburn and Servien; and vol. 71 (expéditions de l'année 1642) contains that signed by Ferté-Imbault and Kintyre on February 27, 1642. The latter is the more valuable as it gives in detail the conditions on which the Guards were to serve. A comparison with that of 1633 shows that the later regiment received better conditions than the earlier one.[1]

A certain amount of information about Moray's recruiting of men for his regiment is contained in the two volumes of *Montereul Correspondence*, published by the Scottish History

[1] There is no trace of the Capitulation signed by Moray on becoming Colonel in 1645. Mazarin speaks of it in at least two letters, one to Bellièvre of March 12, 1647 (*Bib. Nat. MSS.*, 16002, f. 300), and one to Montereul of April 12, 1647 (*Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 50, f. 45).

Society and edited by Mr. Fotheringham : but various MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Archives des Affaires Étrangères, and the Dépôt de la Guerre, afford a large amount of new material. It can be arranged under three heads.

A. In the Dépôt de la Guerre, vol. 94 (f. 260), in the Archives des Affaires Étrangères, vol. 50 (copies), and in the Bibliothèque Nationale, 16002 (copies), there are letters by Mazarin on the subject of the levies ; some of them are addressed to Bellièvre, some to Montereul, and others to Graymond. In the Bibliothèque Nationale, 16002, 4202 (copies), there are letters by Le Tellier, the War Minister, to Bellièvre and Montereul. These two sets of letters indicate the point of view of the French Government and illustrate its policy from 1645 to 1650.

B. Letters from Bellièvre to Le Tellier and Mazarin are to be found in the Bibliothèque Nationale, 16002 (copies) ; and in the same archives, 15994 (copies), but more especially in the Archives des Affaires Étrangères, vol. 56 (originals), there are many from Montereul to Le Tellier. In writing to the War Minister, Montereul naturally dealt solely with military matters so that these letters greatly amplify the knowledge to be obtained in the printed *Montereul Correspondence*. Both the printed and the unprinted sets have to be read with caution, as Montereul was prejudiced against the two Colonels who were levying troops in Scotland.

C. A few original letters by Moray, addressed to Mazarin and Du Bosc, are contained in vol. 52 of the Archives des Affaires Étrangères, but they belong to 1646, whereas 1647 was the important year. In the Bibliothèque Nationale, 15994, there are copies of a few letters written by him to Bellièvre in 1647. They are important ; but, unfortunately, they do not deal with the accusations made by Montereul against Moray and Angus.

It may be added that the Harleian MSS., 4551, in the British Museum, containing copies of Graymond's despatches to the French Government, are useful for the same subject for the years 1649 and 1650, *i.e.*, after Montereul's letters cease.

The MSS. relating to Moray's activities in politics in 1645–1646 and from 1660 to 1670 are as follows :—

A. Vol. 16002 (copies) in the Bibliothèque Nationale contains the three " assurances " given by Moray to Montereul in 1646. Only the first two are in print (see S. R. Gardiner, *Great Civil War*, III. 73, 75). Gardiner asserted that there must have been a third (*G.C.W.*, III. 87), and that which is dated April 2 in vol. 16002, ff. 29–30, is the one of which he surmised the existence. Its value is shown *ante*, in Ch. III. p. 43. The fact that it is merely a copy does not diminish its worth as evidence: this is made clear by four original letters from Moray to Mazarin, written in April, 1646, and contained in Vol. 52 of the Archives des Affaires Étrangères.[1] In one of these letters, Sir Robert explains generally the terms on which the Scottish Commissioners will receive the King. They correspond with those which were set forth in the third " assurance." Taken together these documents confirm the conclusions reached by Gardiner in his chapter on the final negotiations between Charles and the Scots (*G.C.W.*, Vol. III. Ch. XLI).

B. The unpublished Lauderdale Papers (Brit. Mus., Add. MSS. 23119–23134, 35125) do not add very much to the knowledge obtainable from Dr. Airy's selection for the Camden Society. They confirm facts which are implied in the information furnished by the Camden Society volumes. They give additional details with regard to Moray's adroitness in managing Charles II. in 1663. For his administration of Scotland (1667–1668), they are useful in two ways. They throw fresh light on the financial improvements introduced by Tweeddale and Moray; and they help to explain why Moray left Scotland for London as early as June, 1668.

This last point is further elucidated by the Tweeddale MSS. (Lauderdale Letters) in Yester House, which are the property of the Marquess of Tweeddale.

Moray's career as a man of science and his personal characteristics are illustrated chiefly by (A) the archives of the Royal Society at Burlington House, and (B) the Kincardine MSS. (transcripts), which were in the possession of the late Mr. David Douglas, Edinburgh.

[1] See *post*, Appendix C.

A. Three sets of documents in the archives of the Royal Society are of particular interest for the purpose of this biography :—

(1) The Journal Books of the Society and of the Council contain the minutes of the meetings of the Society and of the Council respectively.

(2) The Register Books contain copies of members' papers which the Society considered worthy of special record ; the great mass of papers in the scripts of the various contributors is to be found in the Guard Books.

(3) The Letter Books contain copies or originals of letters written by, or addressed to, either Fellows of the Society or the Society as a body.

The Journal Books are the main authority for Moray's labours in connection with the charters of the Society and its finances, but they do not add much to what can be found in G. R. Weld's *History*. Each of the three sets of documents, but especially the Journal Books of the Society, illustrate his scientific work. The Journal Books, and in less degree, the Register and Guard Books throw light upon his preferences among the Sciences. From this point of view, the Letter Books are disappointing, but they are a source of some value for an estimate of his moral qualities. Many of his correspondents, for example, express their personal obligations to him.

B. The Kincardine Papers were used by Dr. Airy for a very interesting article on Sir Robert Moray, which appeared in the *Scottish Review* in January, 1885. A comparison of them with other sources which were not open to Dr. Airy, or which it was beside his purpose to consult, only enhances their value as evidence. They are of little use for Moray's activities in the Royal Society, but no other source is by itself so useful for an estimate of his mental and moral qualities. As a revelation of his preferences among the sciences, they point to the same conclusions as the documents in Burlington House and his printed correspondence with Christiaan Huygens ; but they contain a larger number of facts in support of those conclusions.

Besides these MS. sources, the Rijks Archieven at Maastricht

in Holland, the Sheldon and the Wood MSS. in the Bodleian, the Balcarres MSS. in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, the Foreign State Papers (France and Flanders) and the Warrant Book, Scotland (1670–1672) in the Public Record Office, also afford some information which the footnotes sufficiently indicate.

APPENDIX B

CAPITULATION BETWEEN LA FERTÉ-IMBAULT AND KINTYRE

(See *ante*, Chap. II. p. 18.)

Dépôt de la Guerre, MSS., 71. Expéditions de l'année 1642. 27 Février, 1642.

Articles et conditions que le Roi très Chrétien accorde au Comte de Kintyre, pour la levée d'un régiment des gardes écossaises et pour marcher devant tous les vieux régiments qui sont en France, et en tous les lieux où Sa Majesté aura des troupes pour son service, et immédiatement après les gardes françaises et suisses, et jouir de tous les honneurs avantages et prérogatives dont jouissent les dits régiments des gardes françaises et suisses, et être payé le dit régiment écossais, tant Colonel et Officiers que Soldats comme seront les dits régiments des gardes françaises et suisses, la dite Majesté promettant pour lui et pour ses successeurs n'admettre aucune troupe en qualité de ses gardes que sous la condition de marcher après le dit régiment de sa garde écossaise : le quel sera entretenu tant en paix qu'en guerre comme les dits régiments des gardes françaises et suisses, sans qu'il puisse être retranché, composé de 30 compagnies de 150 hommes chacune, les officiers compris, le traité étant fait par l'entremise de M. de la Ferté-Imbault, ambassadeur pour Sa Majesté très chrétienne auprès du Roi de la Grande Bretagne, en vertu du pouvoir à lui donné par Sa dite Majesté pour cet effet.

Le dit Sieur Colonel avec ses Officiers, promettant de lever pour le service du Roi le dit régiment sans qu'aucuns officiers ou soldats d'autre nation y puissent être admis, s'oblige

de rendre le dit régiment en France dans le quartier qui lui sera assigné dans le dernier jour de juillet prochain.

Le dit Colonel, comme ses officiers et soldats, prêteront le serment en mains du Commissaire ordonné par Sa Majesté à la conduite du dit régiment, de bien et fidèlement servir Sa Majesté offensivement et défensivement, entre tous et contre tous, excepté le Roi de la Grande Bretagne, leur souverain, ses états, et dominations, et de ne pas quitter le service de la dite Majesté pour quelque cause que ce soit sans congé.

Le dit Colonel, ses dits Officiers et Soldats, ne pourront refuser le service avec le régiment entier ou séparé selon le commandement qu'ils en recevront du Roi par ses Lieutenants -Généraux ou Maréchaux du Camp commandant dans son armée, la dite Majesté leur accordant qu'il demeurera toujours quelque compagnie du dit régiment auprès de sa personne, comme les deux autres régiments des gardes, pour y servir après la campagne prochaine, du retour du Roi, se portant à toutes actions, factions de guerre, comme logements, marches, rencontres, retraites, et autres qui leur seront commandées, ainsi que gens de bien et d'honneur doivent faire, comme sont obligés les régiments des gardes françaises et suisses.

Sa dite Majesté permet la liberté de leur religion au Colonel, officiers et soldats et qu'ils puissent faire leurs prières et prêches à la tête de leur régiment, quand ils seront prêts d'aller au combat ou de faire leur marche, et généralement en toutes les rencontres, soit dans leurs camps, marches, et même dans leurs garnisons, et quand ils désireront, quand il y aura des églises permises de S.M. de leur religion, et encore qu'il n'y en ait point, ils pourront faire leurs prières ou prêches dans le logis de celui qui commandera ou en quelque grange ou autre lieu, sans donner aucun scandale aux sujets de S.M., qui leur permet de faire toutes leurs cérémonies comme mariages, baptêmes, et le tout, sans apporter aucun scandale aux sujets de S.M., aussi que le dit régiment, ni partie de celui, ne sera forcé à aucune chose de leur religion.

Que s'il arrivait qu'eux ou les habitants des lieux où ils seraient fissent quelque chose scandaleuse aux cérémonies que feraient les sujets du Roi dans leur prière, comme aussi si quelqu'un en faisait dans leur prière, S. dite M. promet de

faire châtier les auteurs qui commettraient ces insolences.

S.M. leur promettant que s'ils se rendent dignes en le servant de plus grande charge, S.M. ne fera point de difficulté de les y admettre sous prétexte de religion.

En effet S.M. fera payer les dits Colonel, Officiers, et Soldats, par mois composés de 36 jours chacun, les sommes ci-après declarées.

État-Major.

Au Colonel pour ses Appointements	700	livres.
Lt. Colonel	250	,,
Commissaire de la Conduite	100	,,
Sergent-Major	300	,,
l'Aide-Major	100	,,
Maréchal de logis	60	,,
Secrétaire, Interprète	100	,,
Chirurgien	30	,,
Tambour-Major	30	,,
Au Prévôt, ses Lieutenants, greffier, archers, et exécuteurs de justice	340	,,
Pour chacune Compagnie :—		
Au Capitaine par mois	300	livres.
Lieutenant	100	,,
l'Enseigne	75	,,
Deux Sergents	50	,,
A 150 soldats à raison de 12 livres chacun ..	1800	,,
Au dit capitaine pour appointer les hautes payes	100	,,

Montant en revenance les dits appointements ensemble par mois pour chacune compagnie à la somme de 2365 livres.

Et pour les 30 compagnies ensemble à la somme de 70950 livres.

Laquelle somme avec le paiement de l'état-major montant à 2110 livres revient par mois à la somme de 73060 livres.[1]

Sera donnée au dit Sieur Colonel la somme de 90000 livres pour la levée du dit régiment de 4500 hommes, les dits

[1] The pay for each company adds up to 2,425, instead of 2,365, livres. A company consisted of " 150 hommes chacune, les officiers compris " (see above p. 206). Deducting 12 livres for each of the five officers, and reading " 1,740 " for " 1,800 ", we get the correct total. There is an error of 100 in the monthly sum paid to the " État-Major " (2,010 instead of 2 110 livres). It is easy to mistake " 200 " for " 100 " in some seventeenth century handwritings.

officiers compris, à raison de 20 livres pour chaque soldat, laquelle somme lui sera payée à la ville de Londres, monnaie d'Angleterre, en baillant par lui bonne et suffisante caution au dit Londres, de restituer les dits deniers en cas qu'il ne fasse cette levée aux termes portés par la présente capitulation, auquel temps les commissions du Roi lui seront délivrées.

S.M. fera trouver le Commissaire destiné pour le dit régiment au lieu où il débarquera, pour se faire payer la subsistance aux officiers et soldats effectifs du dit régiment conformément à ce que S. dite M. a accoutumé de faire donner en pareille rencontre aux officiers et soldats des dits régiments des gardes françaises et suisses, et ce jusqu'au temps qu'ils feront la revue pour la montre, après laquelle montre les officiers et soldats payeront dans les garnisons et lieux où ils auront logement comme font les dits régiments des gardes françaises et suisses. Ils seront tenus de prendre le pain de munition, si bon leur semble, S.M. laissant la liberté à ses régiments des gardes de le prendre ou de ne le point prendre, et encore qu'ils prennent paiement, comme les autres régiments des gardes, S.M. ne voulant que ce régiment soit obligé à aucune chose qu'à ce que sont obligés les deux autres régiments des gardes, désirant qu'ils soient traités également.

Seront tenus les dits Colonel et Capitaines de faire mettre le dit régiment en bataille toutes les fois et quand ils y seront requis par le commissaire ordonné par S.M. à la conduite du dit régiment, ou autre que S.M. y enverra par extraordinaire, pour savoir le nombre effectif d'hommes qu'Elle peut avoir à son service et les faire payer sur les extraites de cette revue.

Ne pourront les dits Colonel et Capitaines prétendre qu'il leur soit passé à la montre aucun homme que le nombre effectif qu'ils présenteront en bataille, sans qu'ils puissent rien demander pour les autres.

Le dit Colonel aura la justice conformément aux régiments des gardes françaises et suisses, et pourvoira tous officiers du dit régiment tant pour la levée que ceux qui vacqueront par mort, démission, ou autrement, prenant toutefois les commissions de S.M. devant que de les mettre en charge, S. dite M. donnant cette gratification au dit Colonel de pourvoir

aux charges de son régiment, ce qui n'a été accordé à ses régiments des gardes françaises et suisses.

Ne pourra le dit Colonel donner grâce pour brûlement d'églises, violemments de femmes, filles, ou religieuses, mais sera tenu d'en faire punition exemplaire.

Les dits Colonel, Capitaines, et Officiers, seront tenus d'avertir en diligence S.M., messieurs les généraux, s'il se faisait quelque pratique ou chose préjudiciable au service de S. dite M. ou contre les Ministres.

Nul ne sera si osé que de mettre la main à l'épée dans le quartier ou marchant à la campagne ou même contre quelque habitant de quelque qualité et condition que ce soit.

Si le jour d'une bataille, escarmouche, ou autre rencontre de guerre quelqu'un du dit régiment, de quelque qualité et condition qu'il soit, était cause de quelque désordre, à raison de quoi la réputation des dits écossais fût intéressée, il sera dégradé, et privé de ses gages, et puni s'il peut être apprehendé.

Sera le dit Colonel tenu d'avertir le Roi ou Messieurs les Généraux, s'il arrivait quelque querelle dans le dit régiment, pour être accordée à l'ordinaire, au cas que par son autorité il ne le peut faire.

Ne pourra le dit Colonel faire mettre le taux aux vivres, tant pain, vin, viande, foin, et avoine, par son sergent-major, mais seulement par le commissaire à qui appartient toute police, et comme il s'en pratique dans les deux régiments des gardes françaises et suisses.

En cas qu'il se commet aucun désordre par le dit régiment en la foule du peuple ou autrement, le dit Colonel demeurera responsable de la réparation, sauf son recours contre ceux qui l'auront commis et ce comme les régiments des gardes françaises et suisses.

Le dit Colonel aura le pouvoir de démettre les officiers qui auront été jugés par justice que le Roi lui accorde, ou autres officiers du dit régiment, soit pour crime, faute, ou incapacité, et pourvoir d'autres en leurs places, ou, s'ils sont capitaines, ils nomment d'autres à S.M. pour être pourvu par Elle ainsi que dit est ci-dessus.

En toutes autres ordonnances, réglements, factions, et autres choses, qui peuvent arriver en conduisant et exploitant le régiment, qui n'ont été compris dans la présente capitulation,

le dit Colonel et son régiment seront tenus aux mêmes devoirs que les autres régiments des gardes françaises et suisses et non autrement.

Le dit Colonel promet, en outre, de faire la levée de son régiment, sans prendre d'autres soldats que de sa nation, employés pour le service de S.M.

S. dite M., voulant favorablement traiter le dit Colonel et son dit régiment, lui accorde qu'il ne lui sera fait aucun rabais sur les paiements qui seront faits à son dit régiment sous prétexte des aumônes et six deniers pour livre qu'on a accoutumé de retenir sur la paie des dits régiments des gardes françaises et suisses.

Fait et signé à Londres, ce 27^{me} de Février, 1642 ; ainsi signé D'Étampes La Ferté et Kintyre.

APPENDIX C

CHARLES I. AND THE SCOTS, APRIL, 1646

(See *ante*, Chap. III. pp. 42–5.)

THE following extracts and abstracts should be read in connection with pages 42–5 of the text.

Arch. des Affaires Étrangères, 52, f. 246. May 3, 1646. Du Bosc (?) à Mazarin :—

" Votre Excellence pourra être surpris d'abord du manquement des Écossais dans la lettre de M. de Montereul ; mais celle du Colonel Moray repare."

These words must refer to one of a series of four letters written by Moray to Mazarin on April 2, 9, 15, and 23. The front page of each letter was written in ordinary ink, and the writer spoke of his recruiting activities. The important communications followed on the ensuing pages, and they were written in " encre secrète " (*Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, 246, Du Bosc (?) à Mazarin). The writing is in many places quite illegible ; the letter of April 2 is so *in toto*. Fortunately, this would be the least important of the series.

The second, dated April 9 (*Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 219) ran as follows :—" Votre Excellence aura vu par mes dernières . . . fait pour conserver le Roi de la Grande Bretagne. Mais la semaine passée, quand l'ordinaire partit, je n'avais pas encore . . . les lettres qui furent reçues de M. de Montereul ; ni reçu (?) celle que V.E. aura de sa part, accompagnée d'une des lettres qu'il m'a écrites. . . . saura (?) une bonne partie de ce qui s'est passé à Oxford. J'ai reçu un billet de lui depuis le dernier ordinaire, dans lequel il me mande que le Roi de la G. B. lui avait Chargé (?) de partir de Oxford mercredi dernier pour aller dans l'armée écossaise ; ce qu'il a fait comme j'ai

appris d'autres là-depuis. Il m'a mandé que, n'ayant point encore reçu l'assurance dans la forme que le Roi la désire . . . la copie de celle . . . de sa main pour les députés d'Écosse . . . sont en l'armée écossaise, telle que nous l'avons désirée pour (?) faciliter sa réception. Il aura aussi porté au gouverneur de Newark un ordre de mettre cette ville-là entre les mains des Écossais, ce que le Roi lui avait promis de faire." (Much that is unimportant follows). Then come the words : " Cependant (?) M. de Balmerino et M. de Montereul se seront rencontrés dans l'armée écossaise, étant tous deux partis en même (?) temps." . . . Much of this letter is illegible.

The third and the fourth are very long ; an abstract of each is given below.

April 15 (*Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 231) :—Montereul's letter will let Mazarin see all that happened before Royston. An Agreement was made there as to advance of Scottish troops to Oxford. Three thousand horse to go "à une journée près d'Oxford." Nothing more to fear, except a change of mind on the King's part since Montereul left Oxford.

None about the King wish him to go to the Scots. Independent intrigues. How far Oxford is really blocked. The King will by now have heard from Montereul. Waiting news of his departure from Oxford.

Scots will not force the King to sign a shameful peace with the English Parliament.

Of hostility between the Scots and the English Parliament. Attitude of English Presbyterians.

From here (*i.e.* London) the King has been told of what passed at Royston, lest Montereul's messenger might not reach Oxford.

April 23 (*Arch. des Aff. Ét.*, 52, f. 233) :—

The important words of this letter have been incorporated in the text. They occur at the beginning. Thereafter, the writer proceeds :—Still (*i.e.*, in spite of all that has been done), the affair does not make progress. Why ? Is the King betrayed by his entourage ?

The King wrote to Montereul that he would go to the Scottish army, if possible ; he alleged the danger from Fairfax, as if roads were blocked. This an exaggeration. Discussion of real motives of the Independents.

English Presbyterians are quite discouraged. Scots will always stand by the King, "pourvu qu'il veuille faire encore la Déclaration qu'on a désirée de lui."

Scottish relations to England. Remarks as to those in Scotland who " ne manquent pas de songer à leurs prétensions à la couronne d'Écosse."

For a good issue to the affair, they depend largely on France.

APPENDIX D

SIR ROBERT MORAY'S LETTER TO CHARLES II.

(See *ante*, Chap. V. p. 94.)

BALCARRES PAPERS, IX. f. 157, Advocates' Library, Edinburgh.

Sire, not to trouble your Majesty with a superfluous character of my spirit, I shall only beg leave to say, that though I count nothing I want worth the seeking, and can contentedly endure anything that destroys not sense, so that I thank God I could ungrudgingly brook the utmost of afflictions, the imputation of being the most infamous and abominable of things, a traitor, chiefly such a one as I should be, if I were such indeed as the father of lies hath moved some sinner represent me; yea, though I could silently endure yet more, the very sharpest sting of it, the impression it seems your Majesty hath taken this calumny may possibly be true, which I take to be the very highest pitch to which this point of virtue can be screwed. Yet another no less sublime and vigorous, the lively sense I have of the indispensable duty I owe to God, the Gospel, your Majesty, my Country, my Honour, my Friends and all Mankind, carries me, with as much fervour and passion as virtue can exercise or may own, to endeavour a change in your Majesty's opinion, and to seek to be cleared of this detestable and infernal calumny by all the fair means that are to be found in life or death. And therefore without troubling your Majesty with what I have represented at large of my innocency to your Majesty's Lieutenant-General, I shall call Him that lives and reigns for ever to record upon my soul that I am not author of that letter on which this calumny is founded, and that I am as free of all imagination of harm or prejudice to your

Majesty's royal person, as any child that is yet unborn, or rather more. For my soul is as incapable of acting or employing its vital or rational faculties and powers, or its sensible organs, in any unreasonable design or action, as of being annihilate, or in forming a heap of sand or stones. Next I must in all humbleness implore your Majesty as you are just, as you are my true sovereign, the dearest of human relations, as you tender the honour of your religion, your Majesty's most ancient Kingdom and subjects and your own future tranquillity, to leave nothing undone that may discover the truth of what I am charged withal, and that as your Majesty finds cause, I may speedily be punished or cleared. And then having found me guiltless, your Majesty may, as a master builder doth with his materials (if it be not much fitter to leave me to my voluntary unregarded and useless informity), most sovereignly dispose of and determine, Sire, your Majesty's most humble, most loyal, and most affectionate subject and servant, R. MORAY.

Letter undated.

INDEX

A

Academies, 151. *See* also French
"Accommodation" scheme for the Church of Scotland, 145
Acts of the Parliament of Scotland: Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy, 110; Declaration against the Covenants, 110, 114, 125, 130–2; Rescissory, 111; Indemnity, 111, 114; Episcopacy, 114; Patronage, 114; Billeting and Excepting, 117, 120; National Synod, 117; Conventicle, 144; Supremacy, 144–5; Militia, 145, *n.* 1.
Albemarle, Duke of, George Monk, 109, 116. *See* also Monk
Aldrovandus, Ulysses, 184
Amoma, Sextinus, 188
Anderson, Alex., 196, 198
Angus, Earl of, 63–5, 69, 71–5
Argyle, 8th Earl and 1st Marquis of: his relations with Richelieu, 4, 8, 9; his power in Scotland, 14; and the Scottish Guards, 15–19, 24, 58, 70; 52, 57, 60, 61, 77, 82, 175 *n.* 4, 196, 197
—, 9th Earl of, 124, 132, 158, 186. *See* also Lorne
Arminians: Dutch, 172; French, 108
Ashburnham, John, 40, 42, 45, 46, 47
Athole, Earl of, 85, 95
Aubrey, John, *Brief Lives*, 2, 147, 153, 170, 172 *n.* 2, 177, 178, 196

B

Baillie, Robert, 193, 194, 196, 197
Balcarres, Earl of, 45, 77–91, 93, 95, 97, 99
—, Countess of, 97, 102, 105, 178
Ball, Peter, 151, 152, 161, 177 *n.* 4
Ballantyne, Sir Wm., 138 *n.* 3.
Balmerino, Lord, 30, 33, 34, 36, 37, 44, 213
Bampfield, Col. Joseph, 79–84, 86, 92, 93
Baxter, Richard, 103, 105, 108
Bellenden, Lord, 122, 126, 135 *n.* 2, 139 *n.* 5
Bellièvre, Pomponne de, 5–8, 17, 34*n.* 2, 50, 52, 64, 73, 202
Bennet, Sir Henry, 155
"Billeting" Affair, the, 110, 111, 114–20
Bills of Mortality, London, 185
Borelli, Giovanni, 184
Boyle, Hon. Robert, 151, 152, 153 *n.* 2, 157, 159, 169, 177, 187, 188
Brahe, Tycho, 161
Breda: Treaty of, 75; Declaration of, 105
Brevint, Daniel, 105, 107
Brodie, Alex., 112
Brouncker, 2nd Viscount, 151, 152, 158, 160, 162, 169
Brown, Sir Richard, 25, 29 *n.* 1
Bruce, Alex., *see* Kincardine
Burghley (Burghlie), Lord, 30
Burnet, Alex., Archbishop, 123–7, 135, 137, 139, 144, 145
—, Gilbert, Bishop: *Lives of the Hamiltons*, 52, 54, 55 *n.* 1, 194; *Own Time*, 2, 3, 8, 94, 133, 135, 138, 142, 146 *n.* 1, 153, 168, 170, 171, 173, 174, 176, 177, 180, 181, 190, 191, 194, 195.

C

Calixtus, Georg, 172, 188, 189
Cambridge Platonists, 172
Cameron, Sir Ewan, of Lochiel, 83, 87, 96
—, Richard, 197
Campbell, Anne, daughter of the Marquis of Argyle, 61
Carlisle, Lady, 38
Cassilis, Earl of, 30
Cassini, Jean D., 188
Chambres, the Abbé, 5, 6
Chapelain, Jean, 155, 156
Charenton, Protestants of, 101–3, 106, 107, 172.
Charles I.: his relations with France and the Scots, 3–6; and foreign enlistments, 12, 15–18; in Edinburgh, 14, 16; appeals to the Scots, 26; Mazarin's policy towards, 31; Montereul's negotiations on behalf of, 32–47, 212–4; goes to the

Scottish army, 47–8; his negotiations at Newcastle, 49–54; attempts to escape, 54–5; handed over to the English, 55–6
Charles II.: as Prince of Wales to go to Scotland, 57–9; his proposed marriage with Argyle's daughter, 61; signs the Treaty of Breda, 75; and the Glencairn Rising, 77–97; at Bruges, 98; his religious opinions, 100–4; his religious policy in England, 104–8; and the administration of Scotland under Middleton, 111–15; and Middleton's overthrow, 115–22; and the administration of Rothes, 123–9; and the administration of Moray, 129–141; desires a Parliamentary Union between England and Scotland, 142–4; and the Act of Supremacy, 144–5; and the Royal Society, 154–7
Charron, Pierre, 174
Chavigny, Minister under Richelieu, 6, 8
Chelsea College, 157–9
Clarendon, Earl of, Edward Hyde, 58, 59, 83, 84, 93, 101, 103, 109, 111, 112, 115, 116, 123, 125, 146 *n.* 1, 175 *n.* 4, 181, 194
Claverhouse, John Graham of, Viscount Dundee, 196
Colvil, Wm., 7
Committee of Estates of Scotland, 26, 39, 40, 51, 57, 59, 64, 66, 75
— with the Army, 40, 41, 44, 49
"Comprehension" Scheme for the Church of England, 105, 107
Condé, Prince de, *see* d'Enghien
Conventicles, 134, 145
Cowley, Abraham, 152
Crawford-Lindsay, Earl of, 30, 105, 110, 111, 113, 114, 124, 158
Cromwell, Oliver, 75, 77, 89, 100
Croon, or Croone, Wm., 161

D

Daillé, Jean, 102
Dalrymple, Sir James, 196
Dalziel, Thomas, Lieut.-General, 125, 138
Deane, Major-General, 77
Declaration against the Covenants, 110, 114, 125, 130–2.
d'Enghien, Duc, 27, 28
Denmark, 12, 46
Descartes, 149, 167
d'Estrades, le Comte, 5, 6
d'Étampes, Jacques, Marquis de la Ferté-Imbault, 13–20, 24, 26, 27, 28, *n.* 2, 201, 206, 211
Devonshire, Countess of, 34, 38
Digby, Lord, 36
Dishington, Sir Thomas, 6, 32, 66
Douglas, Lord James, 14, 63
— Regiment, 62–6, 69, 73, 74. *See* also Angus
Drelincourt, Charles, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107
Drummond, Patrick, 198
—, W., of Hawthornden, 196
—, Col. W., 87; Lieut.-General, 125, 135, 138
Drusius, Jo., 188
Du Bosc, M., 32, 48 *n.* 1, 49, 56, 202, 212
—, Protestant Minister of Caen, 107
Dumfries, Earl of, 117, 122
Dunfermline, Earl of, 44–5, 57, 79, 86
Durel, John, 107, 108 *n.* 3
Dutch Arminians, 172
— Protestants, 100
— Wars, 77, 84, 85, 96, 125, 127
Du Vair, Guillaume, 174
Dysart, Earl of. *See* Murray, Wm.
Dysart, Lady, daughter of W. Murray, 142, 145, 146

E

Engagement, the, 58–61, 73
England:
Church of, 104–8, 172; *see* also Uxbridge Propositions, Presbyterians
Parliament of: its relations with the Scots and Charles I., 14, 15, 16, 18, 26, 31, 33, 36–41, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 64, 66, 213–4; projected Union with the Parliament of Scotland, 140 *n.* 1, 142–4
Progress of Science in, 151
Relations with France, 5, 66
Ent, Sir George, 151
Episcopacy (Scottish), 112–4, 116, 119, 125, 127, 128, 130, 134, 135, 138, 139, 144–5
Erskine, Alex., 7, 9, 10, 13, 194 *n.* 4
Estates, Scottish, *see* Scotland, Parliament of,
Evelyn, John, 151, 152, 190, 191, 196

F

Fairfax, Viscount, 46, 52, 213
Flamsteed, John, 161
Fleming, Sir Wm., 58

Fletcher, Sir John, Lord Advocate, 122
Forbes, Sir Arthur, 85
— John, 196
— Wm., 196
France : relations with England, 5, 66. *See* also French
Franco-Scottish Alliance, 4, 16, 32
Fraser of Foyar, 83
French Academy of Sciences, 151, 153, 162
— Army, 11–12, 20–3
— Guards, 22, 23, 24
— Protestant Church, 101–3, 108, 172
Fullerton, Colonel, 14, 194 *n.* 4

G

Gaches, Raymond, 102, 106, 107
Gardes, Françaises, 22, 23, 24
Gassendi, Pierre, 149, 174, 190
Gauden, John, 105
Gens d'Armes Écossais, compagnie de, 2, 9
Germany, 12, 13, 16
Glanvil, Joseph, 154, 188
Glauberus, Johann, 183
Glencairn, Earl of, 81–96, 111–2
Glengarry, *see* MacDonald, Angus
Glisson, Francis, 169
Gloucester, Duke of, 103
Goddard, Dr. Jonathan, 151, 152
Gordon, James, 8
—, Lord, 5
—, Patrick, *Short Abridgement*, 3–9, 194
Graunt, John, 169, 185
Gray, Lord, 13, 14, 194 *n.* 4
Graymond, M. de, 74, 75, 181, 202
Greatrix, Valentine, 188
Gregory, David, 199
—, James, 176, 196, 197, 198
—, Mr., 147
Gresham College, 151–2, 162
Grew, Dr. Nehemiah, 147
Guébriant, le Maréchal de, 13, 28, 29, 62
Guthrie, Henry, 193, 194

H

Halkett, George, of Pitfirran, 1
—, Lady, Anne Murray, 79, 80
—, Sir James, 79
Hamilton, Duchess of, 178
—, 1st Duke of, 49 *n.* 5, 50 *n.* 4 *n.* 5, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 74, 175 *n.* 4
—, 3rd Duke of, 113, 127, 128, 146 *n.* 6
Harley, Sir Edward, 133
Harvey, Wm., 151
Helvelius, Johann, 161
Henderson, Alex., 51, 52, 196, 197
Henrietta Maria, 5, 34, 35, 38, 50, 57, 58
Henshaw, Nathaniel, 152
Hepburn, Sir John, 3, 62, 67, 196, 201
Higgons, Bevil, 195
Hill, Abraham, 151, 152
Hobbes, Thomas, 149
Holland, 5, 13, 59, 103, 104, 185. *See* also Dutch.
—, Lord, 33, 37, 38
Home, John, of Renton, 115
Hook or Hooke, Robert, 161, 169
Howard, Henry, 158
Hudson, Dr. Michael, 46, 47, 48, 52
Hugenots, 101–3, 105–8, 172
Huntly, 2nd Marquis of, 8, 9, 67
—, 3rd Marquis of, 77
Huygens, Christiaan, 154, 155, 156, 166, 167, 168, 175, 179, 181, 185, 187
Hyde, Edward. *See* Clarendon

I

Imbault. *See* d'Étampes
Independents, 31, 33, 36, 38, 39, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 56, 57, 67, 68, 213
Indulgence (Scottish), 144
Ingolstadt, 29
Ireland, 14–18, 33, 39, 41, 53, 139, 156, 157
Ireton, Henry, Lieut.-General, 46
Irvine, Earl of (Lord Kintyre), 4, 9, 16–20, 24–27, 34, 63, 194 *n.* 4, 201, 206–11
Islington, waterpipes of, 149
Italy, 12, 13

J

Jermyn, Lord, 35, 38, 58, 175 *n.* 4

K

Kenmure, 4th Viscount, 87
Kennedy, Lady Margaret, 178
Kepler, 188
Keppoch, MacDonald of, 83
Kilravock, Laird of, 24
Kincardine, 2nd Earl of, Alex. Bruce, 98, 99, 100, 102, 124–6, 135, 146 *n.* 6, 148, 158, 170, 173, 175–8, 181, 185, 188, 189, 192, 198
Kintyre, Lord. *See* Irvine
Kircherus, Athanasius, 29, 149, 164
Kirkton, John, 195
Knox, Henry, 78, 95

L

La Ferté. *See* d'Étampes.
Lanark, Earl of, 30, 57, 60, 66
Lauderdale, 2nd Earl and 1st Duke of: surety for Moray, 30; takes part in the negotiations with Charles I., 37, 52; his mission to the Prince of Wales, 59; comes to terms with Argyle, 60; utilises French Protestant clergy to facilitate the Restoration, 101–2, 105–7; Secretary for Scotland, 111; opposes Middleton's policy, 111–22; opposes the policy of Rothes, 123–4; under his administration Moray inaugurates a milder policy, 126–143; in Scotland as Commissioner, 143–5; change in his character and policy, 145–6; quarrels with Moray, 146, 176, 179
Leighton, Robert, Bishop, 139, 145, 181, 195, 196, 197, 198
Leslie, Alex., *See* Leven
—, Sir David, 196
Le Tellier, Michel, 28 *n.* 2, 30, 63, 65, 68–73, 76, 202
Leven, Earl of, Alex. Leslie, 14, 19, 33, 196
Lilburne, Colonel Robert, 77, 84, 89, 96
Lindsay, Lady Sophia, 140, 178
Linlithgow, Earl of, 135
Livingstone, John, 61
Loch Garry, battle of, 96
Lochiel. *See* Cameron
Lockhart, Sir Wm., of Lee, v, 196
London: Bills of Mortality, 185; bookshops of, 149
Lords of the Articles, 116, 120
Lorne, Lord, 24, 82, 85, 87, 91, 96, 97. *See* also Argyle, 9th Earl of
Lothian, Earl of, 9, 18, 19, 26, 48, 61, 124 *n.* 5
Loudoun, Earl of, Chancellor of Scotland, 6, 14, 19, 33, 34, 37, 40, 44, 48, 57, 85, 111 *n.* 1, 124, 196
Louis XIII., 2, 6, 7, 11, 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 194
— XIV., 42, 101, 102, 107
Lundy, Lord, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20

M

Maastricht, Moray in, 1 *n.* 3, 98, 99, 170, 178, 182, 189
Macdonald, Alastair, 67
—, Angus, of Glengarry, 78, 81, 83, 87, 94
—, Donald Gorme, 83
—, Sir James, of Sleat, 83
—, of Keppoch, 83
Mackenzie, Sir George, of Rosehaugh, 144, 146, 195, 196, 197, 198
—, Sir George, of Tarbat, Lord Tarbat, 79, 80, 81, 115
—, of Pluscarden, 84
Macleod, Captain N,, 82, 87
Manchester, Earl of, 109
Manton, Charles, 105
Maurice, Prince, 40, 42, 45
Mazarin, Cardinal, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 43, 44 *n.* 4, 45, 46, 48 *n.* 1, 49, 50, 51, 62, 65, 68–75, 99, 109 *n.* 2, 177, 202, 203, 212–3
Melo, Don Francisco, 28
Mersenne, Morin, 149
Middleton, Earl of, 78, 81–97, 110–123
Militia: English, 33, 39, 40, 53; Scottish, 119, 121, 130, 131, 134, 135, 145 *n.* 1
Monconys, Balthazar de, 159, 166, 167
Monk, General, 77, 96, 97. *See* also Albemarle
Montereul, Jean, Sieur de: reports offer of British Colonels to serve in France, 13; agent to the Scottish Government 31–2; his career, 32 *n.* 1; his negotiations on behalf of Charles I., 33–49, 212–4; reports on Sir R. Moray, 56 *n.* 2, 57–9, 63, 181; recruiting in Scotland for the French service, 65–6, 68–73; replaced by Graymond, 74
Montmort, Habert de, 149
Montrose, 1st Marquis of, 8, 35, 41, 45, 46, 48, 74, 75, 196, 197
—, 2nd Marquis of, 96, 122
Moray, Sir Andrew, of Bothwell, 1
—, Sir John, 1
—, Sir Mungo, of Craigie, 1, 2
—, Sir Robert: his parentage, birth, and education, 1–2; a Freemason, 1 *n.* 3, 162 *n.* 2; his military service in France, 2; his relations with Richelieu, 3–9; General of the Ordnance in Scotland, 7; (?) General Quartermaster, 10; Lieut.-Col. of the Scottish Guards, 24; knighted, 25; captured at Tüttlingen, 29; a prisoner in Bavaria, 29–30; ransomed, 30, 32; enters into relations with Montereul, 32–3; his mission to Henrietta Maria, 34–6; insists on changes in terms to be offered by the

Scots to Charles I., 37; his two "assurances," 39–40, 203; his third "assurance," 43–4, 203; his account of the Royston conference, 45–6; his share in the negotiations, 47–8, 212–4; with the King at Newcastle, 49; reproached by Mazarin, 49–50; his change of attitude to the Scottish demands, 51; his view of the Nineteen Propositions, 52–3; his trust in Hamilton, 53–4; and the King's attempted flight, 54–5; his opinion of the handing over of the King, 56; his relations with the Argyles and the Hamiltons, 56–8; an Engager, 58–9; his political activities from 1648–1651, 60–1; Colonel of the Scottish Guards, 63, 201 *n.*; recruiting for the Guards, 61–8; French charges against, 68–72; his grievances against the French Government, 72–3; his further efforts to obtain recruits, 74–5; appointed to various Scottish offices, 76, 109; quits the French service, 76; his conduct in the early part of the Glencairn Rising, 79–91; death of his wife, 80–1; accused of a design to assassinate Charles II., 91–5, 215–6; his part in the later stages of the Rising, 96–7; in exile, 98; his financial difficulties, 99, 109 *n.* 2, 180; his share in the Restoration, 99–100; persuades some French Protestant divines to deny that Charles II. had become a Catholic, 100–4; persuades others to write in favour of Episcopacy, 105–8; supports Lauderdale's policy in Scotland, 108–14; "billeted," 114–5; Deputy-Secretary for Scotland, 115–22; his part in Scottish politics 1663–1667, 123–5; his administration of Scotland, 126–42; Deputy-Secretary for Lauderdale, 142–6; a Commissioner for a Treaty of Union, 142–4; his quarrel with Lauderdale, 142, 146; requests Burnet's views on polygamy, 146 *n.* 1; his death, 147; his scientific acquirements, 148–50; a founder, and first President, of the Royal Society, 152–3; obtains a charter for the R.S., 154–5; his interest in the finances of the R.S., 156–9; his experiments as F.R.S., 160–2; his Papers to the R.S., 162–4; his correspondence as F.R.S., 164–8; his services to the R.S., 168–9; his religious opinions, 170–4; his ideals of friendship, 174–7; his relations to women, 178; his patriotism, 178–9; his modesty, 179–80; frequently in debt, 180; Burnet's eulogy of, 180–1, 195; his knowledge of various sciences, 181–6; his attitude to astrology and alchemy, 186–8; his theological studies, 188–9; his delight in music, 189; his attitude to literature, 189; his other mental characteristics, 189–90; contemporary appreciations of, 190–1; why so little known, 192–6; compared with distinguished Scots of his period, 196–9; a type of a transition period, 200

— Lady, 80–1

—, Sir Wm., 1

Morison, Robert, 196, 197, 198

Morley, George, 100, 105

Morus, Alex., 103, 106

Murray, Anne, Lady Halkett, 79, 80

—, Sir Robert, of Cameron and Priestfield, 30, 127 *n.* 1

—, Wm., Earl of Dysart, 38, 54, 55, 61, 84, 86, 92–4, 142

N

Naphtali, 134

Napier, John, of Merchiston, 198

Neil, Sir Paul, 152, 154

Newark, Scottish Army at, 40–9, 51, 56, 59, 213

Newburgh, Earl of, 89, 111, 115, 118, 121, 128

Newcastle, Scottish Army at, 49–55

Nicholas, Sir Edward, 25, 40, 45, 46

Noyers, Sublet de, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 27

O

Oldenburg, Henry, 158, 163, 164

Ormonde, Marquis and 1st Duke of, 52, 109, 112

Oxford, Philosophical Society of, 151

P

Page, Lady, 92–4

Palmer, Dr., 161

Pascal, 149, 167

Peiresc, Nicolas, 190

Pentland Rising, 125, 128, 136
Pepys, Samuel, 159, 189, 196
Perrault, Claude, 162
Petty, Sir William, 149, 151, 152, 166, 167, 169, 177
Philosophical Society of Oxford, 151
Pitcairne, Archibald, 199
Pluscarden, Mackenzie of, 84
Pope, Walter, 161
Presbyterians: English, 31, 33, 38, 41, 56, 58, 100, 104, 105, 107, 213–4; Scottish, 31, 111, 112, 113, 116, 123, 125, 133, 134, 135, 144, 145, 172, 181
Preston, battle of, 59, 74
Primrose, Sir Archibald, Lord Clerk Register, 111, 135
Protestors, 112

R

Reay, Lord, 96, 166
Remonstrants, 77
Resolutioners, 77, 112
Reynolds, Wm., 105
Richelieu, Cardinal, 3–13, 17, 19, 28 *n.* 3, 101
Richmond, Duke of, 115
Roger, Malcolm, 81, 83, 84
Rooke, Lawrence, 152
Rosicrucians, the, 187
Rothes, Earl of, 111, 112, 115, 118–129, 135, 137
Row, W., *Continuation of Blair's Autobiography*, 110, 134, 195
Royal Society, the: nucleus of, 149–152; founding of, 152–3; charter of, 154–5; finances of, 156–9; aims of, 159; experiments of, 159–162, 187; papers read to, 162–4; foreign correspondence of, 164–8; Moray's services to, 168–9; archives of, 204
Royston, conference at, 44–6, 48, 213
Rupert, Prince, 40, 42, 45
Rutherford, Colonel Andrew, 76

S

Sabran, Melchior, Comte de, 31, 32
St. Andrews: University of, 2; Presbytery of, 60
Saint-Evremond, Charles de, 174
Science, progress of, in England, 151
Scot Abroad, the, 199
Scotland:
Church of, General Assembly of the, 26, 60; *see* also "Accommodation," Episcopacy, Presbyterians;
Colouring of cloth in, 166
Customs and Excise of, 119, 136
Giant child born in, 167
Making of malt in, 162
Parliament of: its relations with the English and Charles I., 14, 15, 16, 18, 26, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 54, 61; and foreign enlistments, 15, 64, 66, 67; projected union with the Parliament of England, 140 *n.* 1, 142–4; *see* also Acts, Committee of Estates, Lords of the Articles;
Privy Council of, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 25, 26, 67, 69, 113, 114, 119, 123, 125, 126, 128, 130, 132–8; (in London), 109, 112, 115, 121, 142; revenue of, 135
Scottish army in England, 31, 33, 37, 40–51, 54, 55, 64, 213
— colony in America suggested, 167
— Commissioners in London, 32–49, 52, 56, 63, 66, 203
— Guards in the service of France, 4, 15–29, 58, 63–76, 201, 206–11
— soldiers in the service of France, 3, 14, 25; *see* also Douglas Regiment, Scottish Guards, Gens d'Armes Écossais; Angus, Erskine, Fullerton, Gray
Seaforth, Earl of, 82, 84, 87, 91, 95
Seaton, Sir Walter, 136, 139 *n.* 5
Selkirk, Earl of, 96
Shaftesbury, 1st Earl of, 146 *n.* 6
Sharp, Wm., Archbishop, 107 *n.* 4, 112, 123–7, 134, 139, 140, 141
Sheldon, Gilbert, Archbishop, 116, 127, 139, 140, 145, 173
Sibbald, Sir Robert, 198, 199
Smith, Captain, 78, 83, 84, 85
Sorbière, Samuel, 177 *n.* 4, 180
Spain, 7, 12, 14, 66
Sprat, Thomas, *History of the Royal Society*, 153, 154, 159, 161, 163, 165–7, 196
Stermont, Lord, 158
Sthael, Peter, 187
Strachan, Col. R., 81, 83, 89, 95
Sweden, 12, 13, 64, 166
Swiss Guards, 21–4, 28

T

Tarbat, Lord. *See* Mackenzie of Tarbat
Traquair, Earl of, 57
Tuke, Samuel, 153 *n.* 3, 160
Turner, Sir James, 123, 136–8, 196, 197

Tüttlingen, 29, 62
Tweeddale, Marquis of, 79, 124–9, 132–5, 138–143, 146 *n.* 6, 158, 178, 203

U

Union of the Parliaments, projected, 140 *n.* 1, 142–4
Universities, and Science, 148
Urquhart, Sir Thomas, 194, 196
Uxbridge, Propositions of, 37, 39, 40

V

Van Helmont, 184
Vaughan, Henry, 187
—, Thomas, 187
Vernatti, Sir Philip, 148, 166

W

Wallis, Dr. John, 150, 151, 168, 169
Wariston, Sir Archibald Johnston of, 112
Wilkins, Dr. John, 151, 152, 153 *n.* 2, 158, 160
Williams, Dr., 147
Willis, Dr. Thomas, 151, 169
Winthrop, John, 166, 182
Wishart, George, 8
Wodrow, John, 132, 133, 191, 195
Wood, Anthony, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, 2, 7, 9, 147, 178, 196
Wren, Sir Christopher, 152, 161

Y

York, Duke of, 99 *n.* 5, 146 *n.* 1

Printed by Fox, Jones & Co., Kemp Hall Press, High Street, Oxford